Pub. b Library

Volume VII Number 1

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1930

ISSUED BY THE

Faculty of Crozer Theological Seminary

SPENSER B. MEESER, *Managing Editor*
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, *Business Manager*

CONTENTS

PAGE

A REALISTIC VIEW OF THEISM. William Kelley Wright 5

"THE MODERN DISTEMPER." Powell H. Norton 24

IS THE SUNDAY SCHOOL DOOMED? Conrad Henry Moehlman 47

AN INTERESTING EXPERIMENT IN WEEK-DAY RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. Ivan G. Grimshaw 56

WHAT HAPPENED AT PENTECOST? Milton G. Evans 64

ZIONISM. I. G. Matthews 79

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE 91

NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS 93

BOOK REVIEWS 106

Printed for CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY *by*
THE JUDSON PRESS, PHILADELPHIA

Price, 40 cents. Annual Subscription, $1.50, post free

330339

BOOKS OF MERIT

Early Baptist Missionaries and Pioneers (Vol. I)

By Walter S. Stewart

Adoniram Judson and Ann Hasseltine, Jonathan M. Peck, and Isaac McCoy, and others who wrought abroad and on the American frontier are shown in narratives of striking appeal.
Cloth, **$1.50** net

Early Baptist Missionaries and Pioneers (Vol. II)

By Walter S. Stewart

Brief life-stories of men and women prominent in mission work at home and abroad, including an account of Luther Rice. Illustrated.
Cloth, **$1.50** net

Later Baptist Missionaries and Pioneers (Vol. I)

By Walter S. Stewart

The life-stories of five workers in foreign fields and of four who have pioneered in work in the United States are brought together here. A bibliography of sources is provided. The book is especially adapted for use in study classes and discussion groups. Illustrated. Cloth, **$1.50** net

Later Baptist Missionaries and Pioneers (Vol. II)

By Walter S. Stewart

Nine biographies—eight men and one woman—are included in this closing volume of the series. The mission fields of the world are well represented here. The scene shifts from Brazil to Africa, from Mexico and the Southern States to China, Assam, and Japan. Types of work are illustrated by some very striking figures—medical missions on the Congo by Aaron Sims, pioneering on the Inland Sea of Japan by Luke Bickel. Illustrated. Cloth, **$1.50** net

The above set of four books, beautifully printed and bound, should be in every Baptist church library and in every Baptist home.

A Great Evangelism

By Samuel Graham Neil, D.D.

With an Introduction by Herbert F. Stillwell, D. D.

The author has given his life to practical evangelism—on the street, in tabernacles and churches, in the home, on chapel cars, wherever he has gone in a million miles of travel throughout the United States, in Great Britain, and on the Continent—and is well known as an effective speaker and personal worker and as an able leader. The fruits of his cumulative experiences are gathered in eleven chapters, which magnify the importance of the pastor and of the local church in up-to-date evangelistic endeavor. Cloth, **$1.50** net

Clough: Kingdom Builder in South India

By Herbert Waldo Hines

To read this book is to come into living contact with Clough himself, and to be gripped by his vigorous personality. From the first scene, under the stars on a midwestern prairie, where the boy is discovered to us "filled with anticipations of exciting things and places" to the end when the man takes his place of high honor among the pioneers and builders who have greatly dared and nobly achieved on the mission fields of Asia, there is not a dull page in the narrative. Cloth, **$1.25** net

Fighters for Freedom

By Austen Kennedy de Blois, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D.

The story of some phases of the struggle for freedom is told by Doctor de Blois in the most appealing and effective way — through biographies of stanch champions and pioneers, seventeen of them in all. From the twelfth century to the nineteenth, from Arnold of Brescia to Francis Wayland of Rhode Island, from the struggle with papal intolerance to the development of modern education on the soil of civil and religious freedom—so the story progresses in its illustration of the growth of democracy in all its forms. The book is well illustrated and indexed.
Cloth, **$1.50** net

John Bunyan the Man

By Austen Kennedy de Blois, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D.

The author sets forth his hero against the background of his times, giving first a brief summary of the religious features of English history from the reign of Charles I to the coming of William of Orange. There follow chapters of the life-story of Bunyan, his religious experiences, his imprisonments, Bunyan as a preacher, a theologian, a dreamer, a writer, an apostle of Puritan morals, a man of God. There is a bibliography and also a chronological list of Bunyan's works.
Illustrated. Cloth, **$1.50** net

THE AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

1701-1703 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia

16 Ashburton Place, Boston — **2328 S. Michigan Avenue, Chicago** — **313 W. Third Street, Los Angeles**
1107 McGee Street, Kansas City — **439 Burke Building, Seattle** — **223 Church Street, Toronto**

ORDER FROM OUR NEAREST HOUSE

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

THE CROZER QUARTERLY is issued by the Faculty of the Crozer Theological Seminary with the aid of funds provided by the Trustees at the annual meeting in May, 1923.

The scope of THE QUARTERLY embraces all the departments of instruction in the Seminary. Each professor is responsible only for the contributed material and for book-reviews signed by him, but he may publish such articles contributed by others as may be appropriate to his department, without however incurring responsibility for opinions expressed therein.

The aim of THE QUARTERLY is to familiarize the reader with results of investigation in Biblical and historical and theological subjects pertinent to a curriculum in a theological seminary, and also to be a medium by which pastors busily engaged in the ordinary work of a pastorate, may communicate to fellow pastors the results of reading and experience and reflection on subjects on which they are specially qualified to write. From time to time THE QUARTERLY will present surveys of recent literature in various fields of theological learning.

Remittances should be addressed to

THE CROZER QUARTERLY
CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
CHESTER, PA.

Send other communications and all contributions to

THE MANAGING EDITOR

FACULTY

MILTON G. EVANS, President
Mrs. John P. Crozer Professor of History of Religion

SPENSER B. MEESER
Professor of Systematic Theology

ISAAC G. MATTHEWS
Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis

FRANK G. LEWIS
Librarian

MORTON S. ENSLIN
Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis

STEWART G. COLE
Professor of Religious Education

REUBEN E. E. HARKNESS
Professor of Church History

WILLIAM R. McNUTT
Professor of Practical Theology

GEORGE F. FINNIE
Acting Professor of Homiletics

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER
Director, Extension Course

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post-office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, January, 1930, by Crozer Theological Seminary.

Vol. VII JANUARY, 1930 No. 1

A REALISTIC VIEW OF THEISM

WILLIAM KELLEY WRIGHT

Professor of Philosophy, Dartmouth College

A GENERATION ago Auguste Sabatier taught us that the essential thing about religion is prayer. Recent studies in comparative religion reveal the fact that in all religions men seek the conservation of values through invocation of an Agency of some kind—an Agency that is at once psychical and superhuman. In the theistic religions this Agency is conceived of as God—as a personal Being with whom man may commune in prayer. The crucial problem in the philosophy of religion today, as it seems to me at least, is to decide whether we can still pray. Can we believe in a God personal enough to love us, and to hear and answer our prayers? At least this minimum of traditional theism we should like to retain.

There is no doubt that confidence in the God of orthodox theism has somewhat weakened among philosophers during the past two centuries. There are several reasons for this. First, most of the older arguments for God, like the ontological and the cosmological arguments, in the opinion of most philosophers were completely shattered by Hume and Kant in the latter third of the eighteenth century. Although the argument from design was hesitatingly accepted by Hume, impressed Kant, and was eloquently set forth by Paley, the triumph of evolution

in the nineteenth century has rendered the older versions of this argument untenable, and has—I think unjustly—prejudiced many against the revised formulations of the teleological argument that have recently been advanced as interpretations of evolution.

In the second place, whereas in earlier times many phenomena in all the sciences were attributed to the direct intervention of God, in our time the hypothesis of God is not a necessary explanation for any phenomena studied by any of the sciences. It is no longer necessary to suppose with Aristotle that God as prime and unmoved mover keeps the heavenly bodies in motion, nor with Kepler that his angels guide their courses in elliptical orbits. Since Laplace's time it is not scientific to attribute the creation of each of the separate planets to God, nor since the time of Lyell to classify floods and other geological catastrophes as direct acts of God. Cuvier, I believe, still supposed that all living species were fixed, and each was immediately created by God; but since the time of Darwin divine creation has passed out of biology. And while the origin of life on the earth is still unexplained, scientists are confident that the problem will some time be solved by biological chemistry. St. Augustine offered a theological explanation for all history, and Hegel tried to explain historical events as movements in the progress of a divine Idea; but no historian today would think of accounting for any event in such ways, although I am told that some French peasants who have not read Anatole France suppose that it was St. Genevieve and not Field Marshal Foch who drove back the Germans at the Marne and delivered Paris in 1914 and again in 1918. No phenomena in any of the social sciences are today scientifically explained in terms of divine action.

Now all this does not by any means necessarily exclude natural and social scientists from personal belief in God. But the fact remains that no phenomena, so far as they come within the range of scientific investigation, are described and explained

in a manner at all different by a scientist who personally believes in the existence of God, than by one who does not believe in God.

A third reason for weakened confidence in theism is because of the fact that the conception of God is now known to be a function of the social organization and cultural experience of a people. The notions of the gods are obvious idealizations of human experience. The early Hebrew God is an exalted Semitic sheik; the gods of Homer are magnified Ionian princes; the Nicene God has the titles and attributes that panegyrists were accustomed to address to the Byzantine emperors; Milton's God sits on a throne as a kind of glorified Charles I.

This objection of course is not conclusive. Suppose that there actually is a God in the universe. On this hypothesis the only way men might conceive of him would be in terms of their own experiences. Just as a child of necessity has to think of his father as a child like himself, so must men conceive of God as an idealization of the virtues and powers which they have learned to know and appreciate. But while the objection is not conclusive, it somewhat weakens the claim that religion must be true because it is found among all peoples. Both theists and skeptics recognize the same facts in comparative religion. It is quite possible for a specialist in comparative religion to describe these facts without committing himself on the question of the actual existence of God. And skeptics sometimes invoke the law of parsimony against belief in the reality of God, since the facts of comparative religion can be explained without it.

A fourth difficulty readily follows. Ministers and other religious workers usually endeavor to convince people of the existence of God by an appeal to religious experience. Indeed, this is the only kind of an appeal that it is possible to address to most laymen. But what is a philosopher to think when he is assured by a Protestant minister that many people know that God exists and that Christ is divine because of the way that their lives have been blest, and that he need only believe with

what faith he has, and he will receive like blessings? He recalls having heard Roman Catholics tell how much they have been blest by their faith in the Holy Virgin and the saints. He finds in his library records of the personal religious experiences of Mohammedan and Buddhist saints. And he finds that faith in gods is strongest and most confident among primitive and uncultured men.

The conclusion would seem to be that if the religious experiences of the votaries of any religion are to be accepted as evidential of the existence of God, the testimonies from all the religions must likewise be accepted. To be sure, it may be possible to find something in common in the experiences of the votaries of all religions, and to accept this as truth—as William James did in his *Varieties of Religious Experience,* and Evelyn Underhill in her studies of *Mysticism.* And it may be possible to compare the moral experiences of the different religions, and so decide which is best. But truth and moral worth are not necessarily identical, and we cannot forthwith decide that any religion is more true than the others, simply because it affords larger moral or æsthetic benefits to its adherents.

There have also been difficulties among philosophers regarding the nature of God. Can God both be infinite and also be a personal Being? Philosophers inclined to pantheism have sometimes affirmed that God is indeed infinite, but that for this reason he cannot be a person. Philosophers more theistically inclined insist that God is a person, but they concede that he is limited by the presence of other persons in the universe, and also, some say, by physical matter.

Many philosophers have been troubled with the problem of evil. They concede that much of the evil in the universe can be attributed to the necessity that man should have difficulties to overcome if he were to develop character, and that considerable of the evil that men suffer is due to their own sins or those of other men, while mankind had to have freedom of will including freedom to sin, if they were to develop characters.

But many philosophers do not think these theistic explanations of evil altogether adequate. There is much evil in nature that seems neither to be due to the faults of men, nor a necessary part of an environment in which men might develop their characters. So some philosophers have concluded that the God of such a world as ours cannot at once be absolutely wise, good, and powerful. So John Stuart Mill, William James, and others, unwilling to believe that the wisdom and goodness of God are limited, have concluded that he is limited in power. Leonard T. Hobhouse believed in a Mind in evolution that is gradually gaining control over nature, and is bringing moral order into the world. On the other hand, philosophers of a more pantheistic bent affirm that the moral conflict between good and evil is not ultimately real, and that for God the issue between good and evil does not exist, or else is overcome and transcended.

Let us notice some of these types of philosophical thought more specifically. The reigning philosophy in Great Britain and the United States at the opening of the present century was Absolute Idealism, a form of what its adherents like to call " objective idealism." The most famous representatives of this school during the generation that has just passed away were, in Great Britain, F. H. Bradley and Bernard Bosanquet; and, in the United States, Josiah Royce and James Edwin Creighton.

Creighton carefully avoided religious discussions, and was little interested in the Absolute; he favored the school because of the light it threw on other problems. Bradley, Bosanquet, and Royce all believed that the whole of reality is somehow embraced within an Absolute which transcends all space and time—a kind of Universal Here and Everlasting Now. This Absolute is infinite, all inclusive. Its experience is a complete æsthetic harmony. All the discords of time are part of the eternal symphony enjoyed by the Absolute. The Absolute does not reason, for it knows all intuitively; it has no purposes, because

all its experience is eternally complete and perfect. For it good and evil do not exist, since all is eternally transformed into a completely harmonious unity. Such a Being cannot be worshiped, and when men conceive of the Absolute in the theistic manner as God, as personal, as a Father who hears their prayers and gives them strength and courage to meet their problems, they have made the Absolute into a Being like themselves —who does not really exist in the anthropomorphic form in which they worship God.

This type of philosophy does not seem to its critics to leave much place for the reality of the moral struggles and difficulties of men. Bradley and Bosanquet rejected all belief in personal immortality, and they are usually reckoned the most logical exponents of the doctrine, and have had widest influence. On the other hand, Royce and Pringle-Pattison have argued for personal immortality, while Clement Webb has tried to reconcile the Absolute of Absolute Idealism with the God of theism—the latter attempt in the minds of his critics being as desperate as attempts to square the circle.

Absolute Idealism has proved comforting to some minds. If we thought, as some of the earlier leaders of the movement did, that this philosophy is the only alternative to either materialism or agnosticism, we should welcome it with joy. Although the Absolute Idealist in most instances probably does not ever hope to share in the conscious life of the Absolute as a person, and although he cannot directly commune with the Absolute in the way a theist prays to God, still he finds comfort in believing that all our human wrongs and sufferings are part of an eternally beautiful symphony that the Absolute enjoys. However badly things turn out on earth in our little corner of space and time, the Absolute Idealist can comfort himself by saying, " All is right with the Absolute."

The moral and religious objections to such a philosophy are perhaps sufficiently obvious. The intellectual arguments against it are too involved and technical to be discussed here.

It may be remarked in passing, that the position has been rapidly losing in popularity among philosophers since the opening of the present century. Few contemporary philosophers hold unqualifiedly to Absolute Idealism, even among those who call themselves Idealists; while most philosophers have left the idealistic camp altogether.

During the past ten years a philosophical interpretation of religion has been advanced by some of the Instrumentalists, such as Professors Ames [1] and Haydon of the University of Chicago. This interpretation is in some ways reminiscent of Auguste Comte. According to this view, God is a personification of the collective experience of social groups. In contrast to the pantheism of Absolute Idealism, and to the theism of some of the Personal Idealists, Realists, and Instrumentalists, it will be convenient to call this view "Humanism." The Humanist approaches religion from the comparative and psychological standpoints. He calls attention to the fact, already referred to in this paper, that the conception of God evolves with the social life and experience of a group.

Analogies may help to make the Humanistic interpretation clearer than an abstract statement would do. For example, men personify the collective life of their college, and give it the name of "Alma Mater," pictured as a benignant female personality. They make her the object of loyalty and devotion, championing her cause in athletic contests while undergraduates, and contributing to her support financially when they become alumni.

Similarly, men personify their native lands as Britannia, la France, l'Italia, Deutschland or Vaterland, Columbia, etc., and even, as Ames points out, in humorous but affectionate caricature as Uncle Sam, or John Bull, or Poor Michel.

In an analogous manner men symbolize their collective religious experience as Yahweh, or God the Father.

[1] In *Religion*, which has recently appeared, Professor E. S. Ames seems closer to theism than in his previous writings, which I had in mind in the preparation of this paper. (Op. cit., chap. X.)

More can be said in favor of the Humanistic conception of God than is always realized, even by some of those who hold this view themselves. Absolute Idealists are hardly in a position to reproach the Humanists, although they sometimes affect to do so in a fine show of virtuous indignation. For the Absolute Idealists were among the first to insist that the God of theism is merely a human anthropomorphization of the Absolute, that does not really exist in the manner that God is conceived by the theists.

All of us would admit that the college where we studied has a real existence. And in what sense does a college exist? To say that a college is nothing but a collection of buildings and invested securities would be to commit the fallacy of materialism. Besides these, a college consists of its president, board of trustees, alumni, students, and faculty—together with all those who have in any way been associated with it in the past, those connected with it in any way today, and those who shall serve and love it in generations to come. Moreover, in some sense the ideals for which the college stands, the aims which it endeavors to achieve, are part of the college. The college is an enduring corporate personality—ideals, material equipment, and most of all, devoted men. Each individual who has caught anything of the spirit of his college is a better man because of his experience. The college inspires him to nobler efforts and greater attainments. The college rejoices in his successes, and sorrows in his disappointments. Her honor is in his hands; his disgrace is her grief and shame. Through thought of what his college means to him, many a man has become stronger and greater, and served humanity more effectively.

What is true of a college is still more true of a country or nation. Materially, America is a land, a portion of the earth's surface. Ideally, it is a principle—liberty, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Most of all, it is the human beings of the past, present, and future that have, do, and shall constitute the nation. Washington is revered as the

Father of his country, and Lincoln as the First American. We owe to our country most of what we are—our liberties and opportunities, our culture and traditions, our ideals and aspirations. We revere our Constitution, and at the least sign of danger we are ready to rally around our flag.

What is true of a college, and still more true of a nation, ought to be most true of Humanity. Above all nations is Humanity. The common blood that binds all men of all races together ought to unite them in one brotherhood. To make men self-conscious of their common Humanity is the outstanding moral problem of the twentieth century. If only this can be accomplished, wars will cease, and the universal good-will of which Buddha, the Stoics, and the Christian Church have long dreamed, will at last become an actuality. Religious differences in the past have sadly sundered mankind. Greater than any deity, founder, or saint of any religion is our common Humanity. The Humanist urges us to rally to the support of Humanity, that Great Being, as Comte said, which never dies, and which includes us all.

In a common religion of Humanity it might be claimed that all the separate religions of mankind would finally reach their consummation; they would realize that to which the best religions, those which have sought to be universal, have always aspired. This common religion would revere all the great men who have served Humanity in the past—those of every race and of every religion. Of their names could be made up a new calendar of saints—truly universal, truly catholic, and every day of the year might be designated for the commemoration of one of them.

There would be a strong ethical advantage in favor of the religion of Humanity. One great defect in all historical religions is that every one of them at times has at some point gotten on a tangent. Acceptance of some creedal doctrine, observance of some rite, conformity to the cult, has at times seemed more indispensable than the good life itself. Christians have tor-

tured and burned to death other Christians who have not met their own requirements of doctrinal, ritualistic and institutional orthodoxy. Christians have often believed that the worst of sinners by a death-bed repentance can be saved if he is an orthodox believer; but that for even the best of men there is no salvation outside of Christianity, or even outside of their own particular sect. It would be impossible for the Religion of Humanity ever to get upon such a moral tangent. Religious issues could never obscure moral issues. No ecclesiastic could superciliously frown upon "mere morality," and regard a doctrinally and ritualistically pure life as more acceptable in the sight of God, than a virtuous life. In the Religion of Humanity the inside of the cup would always be spotlessly clean from a moral standpoint.

Nor can it justly be claimed that an adherent of the Religion of Humanity would be seeking purely subjective aid in his devotion to Humanity, that he would be trying to raise himself by his own bootstraps. The man who is loyal to his college or to his country is not trying to raise himself by his own bootstraps. The college and the nation transcend his life, and in invoking them the individual man is invoking what to him is transcendent. Much more would this be true of the man who seeks inspiration from Humanity. Humanity embraces and transcends all churches, all states, all races—much more, every individual man.

There is, as we have seen, much to be said for the God of Humanism. Another of its great advantages is, that it makes no demand upon our credulity. Any one can readily believe it, if only he has a little faith in his fellow men. And yet most of us, if not all, find that such a conception is finally unsatisfactory. We wish a cosmic support for our religion. We wish to believe, if we can, that there is a Power in the universe, besides ourselves and our common humanity, that is making for righteousness, that knows us and loves us, and will come to our support in our spiritual struggles. We like the religion of Human-

ity up to a certain point. But we should like to add something to it. We should like to believe that the personal God of theism really exists in the world, and that he reveals himself to us through our common humanity. If we can believe this, we shall be able to combine the attractive features of both Humanism and Theism. God as revealed in Humanity will enlist our loyal devotion; our worship of him can never get on a tangent, if we keep the moral side of God uppermost, and refuse to let him be lost from us in the misty clouds of pantheism.

In the recent past, theism in America has had its strongest philosophical support from a certain school of thinkers founded by the late Professor Borden P. Bowne of Boston University, known as " Personal Idealism " or " Personalism." The present advocates of Personalism are mostly pupils of Bowne. Their conception of God is of a personal Being to whom men can pray, and who is distinct from us, just as we are from one another. They insist on the freedom of the will, on personal moral responsibility and on personal immortality. In emphasizing these aspects of theism, their position tacitly implies, so far as I can see, the admission that since God does not include the lesser finite persons of the universe, who have free wills and distinct personalities of their own, God is limited. Their form of theodicy seems also to explain the presence of evil by the finitude of God. One of the prominent personal idealists has in fact admitted to me in a private conversation that the position does have these implications for him. It may have the same implications for others.

With the general standpoint of Personal Idealism, so far as religion is concerned, the present writer finds himself in general agreement. The chief difficulty which prevents him from accepting Personal Idealism is on intellectual grounds. The Personal Idealists are true children of Berkeley, and attempt to establish their philosophy by denying the reality of matter. They maintain that all that exists in the universe is minds and the contents of those minds. Such a position

seems impossible to most philosophers today. While Berkeley could refute the obvious objections advanced against his philosophy in his own time, he and the personal idealists seem to most of us today to be hopelessly entangled in the fallacies of the ego-centric predicament, and in an implied solipsism.[2] A more easily understood objection to Personal Idealism is, that it has to maintain that all scientific explanations are unreal; that there are no atoms or molecules or energy except as ideas in men's minds, fictions useful to correlate their sensations and to make predictions, but that in reality there is nothing material in the world at all. For the personal idealist, nothing exists in the universe except minds, human and divine, and their ideas and other mental states. In opposition to Personal Idealism common sense and science are realistic in temper. The outer world is too much with us in the twentieth century for most of us to be willing to admit that it consists of nothing but mental states.

Is there, then, any philosophy left, by which the primary tenets of theism can be defended, viz., faith in a personal God who has the power and the disposition to hear and to answer our prayers, and who will receive us after death unto himself? Yes, the writer believes that theism in this sense is compatible with some forms of contemporary realism and emergent evolutionism. He further believes that all the attractive features of Humanism can be incorporated in this belief in a modified form of theism.

Let us begin by taking a frankly realistic position. The world exists independent of our ideas about it. It is impossible to arrive at any conclusions regarding its nature by consideration of the nature of thought, the conditions of knowing or any kind of dialectic. Our only source of certain knowledge about the ultimate nature of the world is science; our only source of probable knowledge is through comparison of the sciences with one another, and the investigation of hypotheses

[2] R. B. Perry, *Present Philosophical Tendencies*, pp. 129-134, 162f., and *passim*.

not contradicted by scientific knowledge, and supported by at least a few empirical observations.

Where, then, are we to look for evidence for the existence of God? It is clear that we cannot hope to find proof or demonstration of the existence of God. For, as has been remarked, all known scientific facts—in astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology, history, sociology, and psychology, including the sociology and psychology of religion—are equally compatible with theism and with atheism, with the hypothesis that there is a God and with the hypothesis that there is no God and from this situation there is no appeal.

So we must be content with probability. It is obvious that either there *is* a God in the theistic sense, or that there is *no* God in the theistic sense. The two possibilities lie before us. In favor of which does the evidence incline? Which is the more probable? We should not be greatly disturbed by the thought that we must make up our minds about religion on the basis of probabilities and not certainties. Most of the important decisions of our lives are made on the basis of probabilities. This is true, for instance, of the choice of a vocation and the choice of a wife. If we can find as strong grounds for deciding to believe in God as we found for choosing our vocations or for marrying our wives, we can at least be saved from agnosticism.

First, let us glance at evolution. Before there was any life on the earth at all, the combination of chemical elements and compounds—carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen in the stable compounds of water and carbonic acid—furnished the best circumstances possible for the later emergence of life. Yet of the possible combinations that might have existed on the earth and in its atmosphere, there was only one chance in millions of millions, according to Professor L. J. Henderson, a Harvard biological chemist, that precisely the one most favorable for the future emergence of life would be present. Then, after life appeared, evolution proceeded on upward to man.

It further advanced from savage man to civilized man, with his ideals and values.

Now this evolution can be interpreted in three ways: (1) It may be supposed that the evolution went on as a purely mechanical combination of mechanical processes without any latent purpose in it at all. It seems purposive to us, because we assume that its present outcome was its original or gradually evolved purpose. Had the outcome been anything else at all, anybody looking back over it, would have been able with equal plausibility to have called that the purpose. Evolution is purely mechanical, and purposiveness is an illusion.

(2) The second possible interpretation of the evolution is to say that it was the expression of a tendency to organization or integration that proceeded according to mechanical laws, but did not become conscious of itself, or of the values at which it was aiming, until the appearance of man.

(3) The third possibility is to assume that this evolution has been purposive because it has been subject to the direction of a Mind, whom we may call God. That is, God has entertained the purposes that have thus far been accomplished in evolution, and we can infer his further purposes by a study of past evolution. It must be confessed that any one of the three hypotheses would embrace the known facts. There is no crucial bit of evidence that decisively excludes any of them. Yet does not the theistic hypothesis cover the facts more reasonably and more probably than either of the others? So, at least, it seems to me.

Let us look at it in this way. The general course of evolution on the earth seems to reveal either a most astonishingly lucky combination of elements, or else a vast purposiveness—a tendency toward integration so vast and extensive that the human mind cannot pretend to grasp it all. Professor William Patten has spoken of a " creative purpose in evolution, and the moral and ethical grandeur of its accomplishments "; [3] and he

[3] *Evolution*, Part III, p. 214.

finds "One essential underlying method common to all the creative processes of nature," *viz.*, "progressive creation through mutual service." [4] So we exclude the first hypothesis, that the evolution has been exclusively due to purely mechanical processes. If then, we accordingly conclude that evolution is the expression of a vast purposiveness or tendency to integration, to what kind of Being may we most reasonably ascribe this purposiveness? To a vast being somewhat like a plant—some lowly organism that has purposes such as integration and the struggle for existence, without *knowing* that it has these purposes? Or, shall we ascribe these purposes to a Person with a mind and a will, and an environment—a Person who is using materials to carry out his plans? Personality is the highest type of integration of which we have any knowledge. Surely we should ascribe the teleology of nature to a Being more analogous to the highest form of integration of which we know, than to any lower form.

One objection that will be sure to occur to some is that the course of evolution has not been in a straight line. There have been many windings and turnings. Moreover, there has been a tremendous amount of failure. Many forms of life have perished, many have not advanced at all, some have degenerated. There is a terrific amount of waste in the processes of nature. Moreover, consider the tremendous amount of evil and suffering. How reconcile all this with a divine Agency? An Absolute Idealist would reply that all that seems to us evil is good from the standpoint of the Absolute Mind. But how can we know this? The evil seems to us to be as real and genuine as the good. Why not say that all that seems to us good we would know at bottom to be evil and frustration if we could see all reality from the standpoint of the whole—a position actually taken by the German idealist Schopenhauer. The best answer, as it seems to the writer, is somewhat along the lines of traditional theism. With the materials from which

[4] *Grand Strategy of Evolution*, p. 313.

God had to choose, he has builded the best of possible worlds. Men had to be given freedom of will and obstacles to overcome if they were to develop character; and that meant hardship, struggle, suffering, and sin. But with divine assistance man can overcome the difficulties in his environment, and make this a better world. The theist can neither be an optimist nor a pessimist. He must be a meliorist.

All this seems to imply, if the theist is willing to be honest, that the power of God is limited. The best way he could direct the course of the evolution of this particular planet, so as to achieve the realization of human values upon it, was the way it actually has evolved. And it is not a perfect way. God, like an artist, is apparently limited by the character of the materials with which he has to work. But Mind—divine and human—seems to be gradually coming into larger control of conditions as evolution advances.

But what of dissolution? When the earth shall grow cold, and human life shall first decay and later disappear—what then? Well, nothing has to endure eternally in order to have been worth while. Think how many noble deeds, how many works of art have been accomplished only to perish and be forgotten. Somehow I cannot understand the man who thinks that he would have no moral or religious inspiration to make the most of his present life if he were to come to believe that the earth will probably freeze up a million or a billion years from now. Even if God were thought to be doomed to ultimate extinction, to a sort of scientific *Götterdämmerung,* with the destruction of our solar system, would there not still be reason to serve him, to trust him, and to derive strength from communion with him, here and now?

On the other hand, astronomers have sometimes suggested that solar systems, after they grow cold, become dissolved again into nebulous mist by the collisions of their members. From this nebulous material the process of evolution will be repeated. It may be possible, as Herbert Spencer sup-

posed, that evolution and dissolution succeed one another endlessly. While one solar system is evolving, another is dissolving. If this indeed be true, it seems conceivable that God will endure forever. Cells are worn away and replaced in our own organisms so that very few of them remain after a period of seven years. Yet our conscious selves continue. Suppose that solar systems and even galaxies of stars are cells in the body of God, and that they ever wear away and are ever renewed, without arresting his conscious life. This seems to be a speculative possibility.

The chief difficulty, the author supposes, in the suggestion that evolution and dissolution may continue eternally is the second law of thermodynamics. This law seems to imply that each time a new solar system evolves after the dissolution of an old one, there is less energy available than in the preceding one: that finally, therefore, the universe will run down completely. All energy will be completely degraded. Literally, and for all time thereafter, there will be nothing doing. The author has always hoped that some time the physicists will discover some process compensatory to the second law of thermodynamics—some way in which energy is renewed and regenerated. Bergson has suggested such a process, but his hypothesis has no scientific standing. But possibly such a process will be discovered. At any rate, with recent indications that the earth will not cool off for a much longer period than used to be supposed, and the data indicating the probability that our galaxy is only one of multitudinous galaxies of stars, the universe becomes so vast, and the prospective length of duration of evolution so great, that our imagination cannot grasp it.[5]

We are quite ready to believe in the unending immortality of God and of ourselves if the astrophysicists will permit us to do so.

In any event, we can believe in a God and in a future life

[5] Sir James Jeans denies that the process of evolution can be repeated in cycles, but he predicts that man will survive upon the earth for a million years. (*The Universe Around Us*, pp. 309, 330.)

of such great duration that the layman cannot conceive of its length. For him, it is certainly "practically infinite." That is all that is necessary to enable us to trust in God and to look forward to a future life in blessedness. We are therefore justified in prayer to God for spiritual refreshment and encouragement, and for strength to cooperate with him and with our fellow men in order to realize a better life for ourselves and for society.

The first and primary argument for the existence of God, as has been seen, must be based on evolution. This argument, however, receives a certain support from religious experience. Let us suppose, for the moment, that the argument from evolution is sound, and that God truly exists. On this hypothesis we should expect him to reveal himself to mankind as rapidly as men become capable of receiving and understanding such a revelation. Let us now turn to the history of religions and to the psychology of religion. We find that primitive men originally thought of God very crudely, and that our own children do so today; but that as men in past ages advanced in civilization, and as our own children develop in intelligence, the idea of God evolves correspondingly. Moreover, in all ages there have been prophets and saints who have gained finer divine insights than their contemporaries, men who have been able to disclose some of their own superior conceptions to others. And ordinary men and women believe that in prayer they come into communion with God and receive strength according to their needs. So the argument from religious experience bears out the hypothesis of God derived from evolution. Although, as was pointed out earlier in the paper, the argument from religious experience is not convincing when advanced by itself, it does acquire positive force when used in combination with the argument based on cosmic evolution.

In conclusion, therefore, the author of this paper believes, chiefly on the ground of evidence drawn from considerations of evolution and of religious experience, that there is a God. This

God is cosmic, not simply the God of Humanism. He is a Person. He has revealed himself to mankind in the evolution of the world's religions. He reveals himself to individual worshipers in their personal prayers, and comes to their spiritual assistance, although not in a way contrary to the law of the uniformity of physical nature. God, being a Person, is necessarily limited in power, as all persons are. He is limited by physical matter, as well as by the lesser persons in the universe who have free wills, and who do not in all cases choose to cooperate with him. Whether or not he is limited in spatial extent or in temporal duration depends on the conclusions of the astrophysicists on such problems as whether life appears on other planets than ours, whether stellar evolution goes on endlessly, whether space is infinite or limited, and whether time is infinite or has absolute termini.

In any event, God is " practically infinite " in his relations with men. He is able to assist us to a far greater extent than our little minds can conceive. We have incalculably more reason to trust in God, and be confident of his wisdom, power, goodness, and love than our children have to depend on us. We are fellow workers with God in the common effort to make the world better, and to realize the highest values which he has as yet revealed to us.

"THE MODERN DISTEMPER"

"This Strange Disease of Modern Life."—*Arnold*

POWELL H. NORTON

Pastor, First Baptist Church, Hightstown, New Jersey

READING the book by Mr. Joseph W. Krutch entitled *The Modern Temper,* I was forced to the conclusion that it really was a *"distemper"* which was portrayed in the work; a mental, or if you please, a spiritual sickness, very prevalent today. And after reading Mr. Walter Lippmann's work *A Preface to Morals,* wherein he states that the "acids of modernity" have eaten away the ancestral guides of life and thought, I came to believe that what we were really suffering from was "acidosis" —*too much acid.* And these acids, says Lippmann, are so powerful in their corrosiveness that they make it impossible for a new crystallization to form out of the old ways of thought and living. Gone, and gone forever are the ancestral ways of thinking and living.

Now possibly there may be those who object to bracketing together Krutch and Lippmann. There may be those who, being familiar with the attitudes of these writers, feel that they represent different, if not irreconcilable, view-points.

Our contention is that while superficially these two philosophies may be different, in the long run they come out to the same end. The *Weltanschauung* of the one is just as fatal to the beliefs of evangelical Christianity as the other, or to continue the figure, they simply represent two stages of the same disease, and their issue is the same, namely, *"death."*

No one conversant with the way the tides of thought are running can afford to be ignorant of or indifferent to the issues presented in these two books. The books themselves are not, despite their charm and fascination, their lucidity of thought and expression, particularly important; what gives them importance is the fact that they represent a distinct way of

thinking and living in our age with which Christian leaders must certainly come to grips.

There is laid upon them the solemn responsibility of being cognizant of the ways and methods and modes of thinking and living which prevail in their own age. You will remember our Lord's remarks concerning those who had a facile ability to tell the weather of tomorrow but were ignorant of the great tides of thought and feeling which were swift and strong in the currents of their "today." I sometimes feel that ministers live in a world alien to the world of the great majority of men. I have listened to some of them talk and wondered what world they lived in; even their very language was unintelligible. As far as I was concerned, they might be talking in Sanscrit.

One of the first demands laid upon a prophet is that he know his *day* and *generation*. Many things may be forgiven him, but to be ignorant of his own day instantly disqualifies him from his prophetic office. As Doctor Fitch puts it—"the most fateful undertaking for the preacher at this moment is that of analyzing his own generation." Not that he must needs fall in step with it—not that he clutch to his heart the rallying cries of the market-place and succumb to the prevailing *Zeitgeist*. No—not that. I recall a remark passed upon Poe by a critic, "He suffered from contemporaneousness." That fault also lies crouching at the door of each prophet today. They may be *too adept* in their use of the language of today! Their very familiarity with their own day's manners and customs may betray them, e. g., there are many services today in Christian churches which might well pass as meetings of a Chamber of Commerce! But, appreciating that danger—and they do well to be on their guard against it—they too must recognize the opposite danger which obtains—in the words of Fitch again—

> of proclaiming a universal truth in the unintelligible language of a forgotten order and applying a timeless experience to the faded conditions of yesterday. The preacher tends to underestimate the comprehensive

character of the pervasive ideas, worked into many institutions and practise which are continually impinging upon him and his message. They form a perpetual attrition, working silently and ceaselessly day and night, wearing away the distinctively religious conceptions of the community. Much of the vagueness and sentimentalism of present preaching, its uncritical impressionism, is due to the influence of the non-religious, or at least, the insufficiently religious character of the ruling ideas and motives outside the church which are impinging upon it and upon the rest of the thinking of the moment.

The prophets need to be on their guard lest they find themselves going out to war with 10,000 men against a king with 20,000; and although they are armed with bows and arrows, the enemy proposes to do business with shrapnel and high explosives, tanks and poisonous gases.

Organized Christianity has often been found employing great numbers of men to reduce fortifications long since abandoned by the enemy, and carrying on a terrific warfare against trenches no longer occupied. It is that we might avoid that condition that I write concerning the causes of this spiritual "acidosis."

What is the great issue presented in such books as those which I have mentioned?

Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin thinks that the new interest in public worship is of great significance. He runs over rapidly the great issues which have agitated the church in the past 50 years: Biblical criticism; comparative religion; the social interpretation of the gospel; the application of psychology to religious experience—and now, the question of the technique of public worship. But those who sit in the seat of the scornful might well say that this interest is, in the jargon of our new psychology, "a defense mechanism." An acute critic says that there is "an abiding peril, always crouching at the door of ancient institutions: that they seek refuge from the difficulties of thought in the opportunities of action."

What is the use of elaborating the worship of a deity whom the very worshipers are not sure exists? Ministers might be

surprised if they knew to what extent the spirit and attitude of unbelief, or agnosticism, has penetrated even into the church itself. The prayer of the soldier going into action, "O God—if there be a God—have mercy on my soul—if I have a soul," represents the attitude of a great host of professing church-members. There are many reasons given for the lack of enthusiasm in Christian missions. I do not think that it is caused by selfishness and greed on the part of the church-members. I think that it is a logical attitude of an agnosticism which has chilled the fervor of a faith which gave birth to the rallying cry, "The Evangelization of the World in this Generation." From that magnificent plan of taking the Paris of the enemy—we have descended to being contented with digging ourselves in, and we flatter ourselves that all is well if we can report, *"All Quiet on the Christian Front."*

People are not going to agonize over the lost souls of Chinese and Indians when they are not persuaded that they have souls of their own. And, what is more—they are not going to pray very long to a God who is a sort of a religious Santa Claus. A God, who is to be likened to Uncle Sam or the incarnate spirit of Alma Mater, has no solace for a broken heart, even though he, or it, might appear attractive to some divinity professor.

The point I make is, It is foolish to waste time dealing with petty squabbles over questions of text, or exegesis, or historical method when the enemy is disputing the *reality* of *religious experience itself*. And to bother about where the sermon is to be placed in an hour of worship rendered to a non-existent deity is the most fatuous of exercises.

To give ourselves to applying plasters and seeking to heal by crying, "Peace, peace!" when body and mind and spirit are desperately sick is to reduce our office as "physician to the soul" to the level of the quack and the charlatan.

Now, this malady, this soul-sickness (pardon me if I continue to insist that it really is a sickness), is evidenced in sev-

eral different forms. There is an intermediate stage which I shall diagnose as "Humanism"; and there is the final stage, with rigor mortis already set in, which is known, for want of a better term, as "Naturalism."

I wish to speak, in turn, concerning these two stages. I have been very much interested, for several years now, in a study of what is termed "Humanism." It really is surprising the number of times and the number of places where one comes across the word. If one thinks that because he is familiar with what is known as "Classical Humanism," that flowering of the human spirit which occurred in the Middle Ages, he is therewith familiar with the genius of Humanism today, he is due for a rude awakening. To be sure, he will not understand modern humanism if he does not know its antecedents; but the humanism of today is concerned with far more than the classics of Greece and Rome, the renaissance of an interest in "humane letters." And it is a far cry from the wish of Petrarch, father of classical humanism—"This do I desire for myself when death overtakes me, he may find me either reading or writing, or if Christ so will it, praying and in tears"—a far cry from this to some of the rather jaunty attitudes of those who label themselves as *"Humanists"* today!

Of course it is as hard and difficult to define Humanism as it is to define a Baptist. When people ask me what a Baptist believes I always answer: "Heaven only knows; what Baptist are you talking about?"

So is it with humanists and humanism. There is what Dr. Lynn Harold Hough calls "Evangelical Humanism," and the picture he presents of that attitude of Christian thinking and living is a most attractive one. Would to God that we might all be "Evangelical Humanists"! A keen mind, alive and alert and appreciative of all of the glorious achievements of culture, but a keen mind fired with an evangelical fervor and a faith in which Christ, the revelation of God, is centrally enshrined. I think that Paul Elmer More, of Princeton, a

man with a delightful personality as well as a man of great erudition, is a fine example of "Christian Humanism." We cannot have too much of that form of Humanism. Then we have the type represented by Prof. Irving Babbitt, one of the great, outstanding critics of literature, and others like him. These are noble men, and we do well to sit at their feet and listen to their message; although I feel also that having heard it, we must part company with them, to listen to One, an even greater Humanist.

There is the movement in Unitarianism (significant place to find it), which has preempted to itself the title "Humanist." From the controversies of the past century centering in the dispute about the person of our Lord, these have come to reject a theistic interpretation of religion. If you want to know what the men in this movement believe, the creed of their humanism, read the book of sermons edited by Dr. Curtis W. Reese, of Chicago, entitled *Humanist Sermons*. They make brilliant reading, although I must confess that as I read the book my spirit grew more and more melancholy, and I do not wonder that such a gospel succeeds in emptying a church about as rapidly as any device ever invented by man's ingenuity. I should not discount the fine humanitarian spirit of these men, their evident passion and desire to shatter to bits this unchristian civilization and remold it nearer to a standard where human personality will really be honored, and I should not be guilty of indulging in the criminations and recriminations which have characterized theological disputes in days gone by. But I must also express my faith that this way lies death for all that evangelical Christianity has stood for and lived by and through for nineteen centuries.

And there is the Humanism represented by Mr. Walter Lippmann and his gospel which is so winsomely presented in his book *A Preface to Morals*. If I were not a Christian, if I did not have a New Testament, I think that I should try and be a Humanist after Lippmann's way of thinking, and I might

well take his book as my Bible. As one critic of the book put it—

"To THINK according to the Epicurean way and to LIVE according to the Stoic philosophy—this is about as near a satisfactory solution of the human problem as can be secured." Just so—if we do not count the Christian way.

Well, what of this movement? (And we must understand that it possesses a fascination which is attracting some of the finest spirits in our day, both East and West.) Wherein does it come short of that which Evangelicals believe necessary for a faith adequate to live by?

Pertinent are the words of Doctor Coffin:[1]

> It would seem that the belated Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy is passing. Both sides must recognize a *serious menace* to vital Christian faith on the horizon in the Humanist movement which makes God simply a name for the ethical ideal evolved by mankind, and attempts to draw its moral standards from a study of human behavior.

What is it that makes Humanism a menace to vital Christian faith? A short answer is, I suppose, that it denies everything which evangelical Christianity holds to be true. "It were to be wished that the enemies of Religion would at least know what it is before they attack it."[2]

Let us start with the idea of God, for that is the proper place to start, since, as Professor Allen says in his *Continuity of Christian Thought,* "There is no theological doctrine which does not undergo a change in consequence of the change in our thought about God." And one might add, And all other doctrines, sociological and philosophical, as well as theological.

Now it is quite obvious that it is impossible for me to deal adequately with this "storm-center" of modern thought within the limits prescribed by this paper. We are told on all sides by modern critics of religion, or at least, of evangelical Christianity, that the old ideas of God must go. You will recall the furore

[1] From a commencement address delivered at the Union Theological Seminary, May 28, 1929.

[2] Pascal, *Pensees.*

created by Prof. Harry Elmer Barnes in his paper which he read before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in which he roundly denounced the conception of God prevailing in what he terms "orthodox circles." No one of sense will deny that there is a constant necessity for a revision of our idea of God. Certainly the God of childhood days is not the God of our maturity. "When I was a child, I thought as a child," although even here, we might well pause for a moment before we discard as puerile those first ideas of God which we had as children. When I was a child in pinafores, my grandfather, a man of patriarchal appearance, with flowing white beard, nearly ninety years of age, used to come Saturday mornings to take me for a walk. As we walked along the road with my hand in his, and he talked to me about growing into the man that my dear mother wanted me to be, as I looked up into his face I thought of that verse, "And Enoch walked with God." And God to me was a venerable, gray-bearded gentleman who walked and talked with men as my dear old grandfather walked with me. We laugh, do we not? And yet there is a pang of pain back of the laughter which possibly only the words of Thomas Hood's "I Remember" can explain:

I remember—I remember the fir-trees tall and high,
I used to think their slender tops were close against the sky.
It was a childish ignorance, but now 'tis little joy
To know I'm farther off from heaven
Than when I was a boy.

What a tragedy for a human being to be farther off from heaven as a man than when he was a boy! And this tragedy we see on all sides. Sam Foss in his poem "Two Boys" well pictures the dilemma, the tragedy which has overtaken many moderns.

A boy was born mid little things,
Between a little world and sky,
And dreamed not of the cosmic rings
Round which the circling plants fly.

He lived in little works and thoughts,
Where little ventures grow and plod,
And paced and ploughed his little plots,
And prayed unto his little God.

But as the mighty system grew,
His faith grew faint with many scars;
The cosmos widened in his view—
And God was lost among his stars.

No, we will agree that there is laid upon us the necessity of "dreaming a new God" as new experiences open up new vistas. *That* was a tight, little universe that bewildered the man who wrote the Eighth Psalm. "How could he," we laugh bitterly, "be lost in such a trivial little affair?" as we think of the terrifying universe revealed to us by our modern astrophysics. And yet—the tragedy of losing a little God is not necessarily final, there are other verses to the poem.

Another boy in lowly days
As he, to little things, was born,
But gathered lore in woodland ways,
And from the glory of the morn.

As wider skies broke on his view,
God greatened in his growing mind.
Each year he dreamed his God anew
And left his older God behind.

He saw the boundless scheme dilate
In star and blossom, sky and clod;
And as the universe grew great,
He dreamed for it a greater God.

It is the God of Professor Millikan and Professor Eddington that Mr. Mencken needs to come to grips with and not belie what he is pleased to call "The God of the Bible Belt."

But this phenomenon, a changing conception of God, is nothing new. Did not one of the old Greek sceptics say that if an ox could picture a God he would certainly picture him as

an ox? And is not the Bible itself a record of the fact that man has ever been reaching out after a satisfactory conception of God, and the record is frequently a *critical* appreciation of that fact? Some of our moderns might well ponder the Fiftieth Psalm—particularly the verse which declares: "Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as *thyself*" (ver. 21). And there is much laughter and ridicule poked at the "Methodist God," or the "Baptist God," as Mr. Mencken likes to put it, "Such droll anthropomorphisms!" Well, Canon Streeter has something to say about such anthropomorphisms as "mechanism" which I think is pertinent. And how an *anthropos* can have *any idea* which is not anthropomorphic is more than I can conceive.

The evangelical Christian has no need to be ashamed of the idea which Christ gives us of God. It might be, as Professor Barnes says, that "we have outgrown the old conception of God"; but one would like him to define a little more clearly the idea of God which he is talking about. Does he mean the idea of God which Jesus gives us when he says, "When ye pray, say, Our Father"? Have we outgrown that conception of God? I think that it is the next move for those who have outgrown it to give to us the substitute.

And what a substitute Humanism gives us! Do you remember the bewilderment of that pagan soldier who had made his way ruthlessly into the Holy of Holies to see what was there, and found—Nothing? Equally barren is the Holy of Holies of Humanism! And we cannot delude ourselves, as, it seems to me, some of our moderns do, by clothing that "*nothingness*" and calling it God, or Santa Claus, or Uncle Sam, or Alma Mater! It seems to me, as I read Professor Ames' book *Religion,* that his effort to present such a God must be as futile as the efforts of a man to lift himself by his own bootstraps! I may not do justice to Professor Ames, in mentioning his name in a discussion of Humanism. My defense is that, however different the name of their schools might be, they come out the

same place in regard to their idea of God. That there is any *real difference* in the intellectual atmosphere of books so varied as Professor Ames' *Religion,* Julian Huxley's *Religion Without Revelation,* and Walter Lippmann's *Preface to Morals,* I cannot see. To be sure Professor Ames occupies a chair (and a pulpit) in a Christian institution—which does constitute a difference!

Prof. Julian Huxley in his book *Religion Without Revelation,* says:

> For my own part the sense of spiritual relief which comes from rejecting the idea of God as a supernatural being is enormous. I see no other way of bridging the gap between the religious and the scientific approach to reality. But if this rejection is once accomplished, the abyss has disappeared in the twinkling of an eye, and yet all the vital realities of both sides are preserved.

Such a statement moves me to laughter, and I am reminded of the argument of the fox in the fable, who having had the misfortune to lose his tail in a trap, forthwith endeavored to convince all his fellow foxes that a tailless condition was "à la mode"—just the thing for an up-and-coming fox, and besides the condition was "Just as good." But there is a limit even to the credulity of people in their willingness to take things "just as good." There is the point of the whole argument to me. These humanists want the moral dynamic, the peace, the poise, the serenity of mind which come from religion and at same time want to dispense with religion itself. To argue seriously that you have retained all of the vital realities of religion after you have bowed God out, no matter how ceremoniously, is simply juggling with words. The ancient Egyptians and Babylonians showed better religious sense in their representations of deity; for, although they acknowledged the "human" element in religion—portrayed perchance by the human form—the transcendent element was also recognized in the representation of non-human characteristics.

Let us look for a moment at the idea of sin which prevails

in this type of thinking. The Humanist parts with sin with evident relief. (So might we all, if we could!) Professor Barnes says we must rid ourselves of this nonsense about sin, and Professor Huxley says:

> Once it is recognized that the sense of sin is often, and especially in adolescence, a mental disease, something to be avoided if possible and got over with (like the measles) with the utmost celerity, instead of being paraded as admirable, the *great step* will have been taken. It is nothing to be ashamed of, any more than measles; but, also like measles, it is nothing to be proud of.

That is indeed a great step! It is a pity that Professor Huxley could not have been at hand when the agonized cry came from the heart of the author of the Fifty-first Psalm: "Cleanse me from my sin! Against thee, thee only, have I sinned." It would have been a great help to him, if he could have learned that it was just as foolish to be ashamed of that thing which had degraded his manhood as it would be to be ashamed of a running nose!

An Englishman says, "This generation is not worrying about its sins"—a rather jaunty, pert saying, and one which, at times, we are inclined to accept as true. But as Hutton reminds us: "This generation is not worrying about its sins. Neither were the people on the Titanic worrying about icebergs."

We all have sense enough to realize that much effort has been spent in trying to induce, both in childhood and adulthood, an artificial and unreal attitude toward sin—evidenced in our hymns. And the Christian church people need to meditate upon Ellen Glascow's dictum in her latest book *They Stooped to Folly:* "The only art which Americans have developed to perfection is the art of hypocrisy." But nevertheless it is true, that deep down in the heart of man there is a desperate sickness. And to tell a man, who is wrestling with the agony induced by that sickness, that he has "spiritual measles," is to mock and make light of his sad plight. And even measles are not to be

discounted! I dare say if all the disabilities which have come from measles were brought together, there would be a rather appalling exhibit. To all such we say, "The answer to a broken heart thou dost not know." And further, to all such we quote: "If any man say he hath not sinned, he is a liar and the truth is not in him." Nor need we quote Scripture; it is enough to present the testimony of the saintliest of men and women of all ages, who have beaten their breasts and cried, "God be merciful to me—a sinner!"

Humanism, first of all, expects too little of a man. It expects him to be religious although it has deprived him of his fellowship with a loving Father. And then it expects too much from him: It expects him to live as if nothing vital had happened to him. Evangelical Christianity affirms its faith in God, in Christ, in man in his sinful estate, in the words of Paul, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself."

And for a man to say, as did Faust, "Evil, be thou my good!" is to take a fatal step in the direction of death. So much for the part which Humanism (and this is rather a comprehensive designation, I confess,) has played in producing the "acidosis" which Lippman says is to be found in our modern life.

And now, a word as to the final stage of unbelief as we see it evidenced in modern thought and life. There are those who like Krutch, having accepted the premises of the Humanists, carry them out ruthlessly, albeit bitterly, to the very end—which end is as bleak and desolate and forbidding as the eschatology of Bertrand Russell, painted in his *Mysticism and Logic* and *A Free Man's Worship*. This attitude of mind, or this stage of our "acidosis" is designated "Naturalism."

Again we face the difficulty of definition for the attitude of mind which I call Naturalism; it is as old as philosophy itself, as Shaver suggests. He says (*Christianity and Naturalism*):

It [Naturalism] is one of two rival interpretations or estimates of the character of life which have existed side by side in continuous hostility since the dawn of conscious thought. And naturalism has ever been a powerful foe of religion, nor had it to await, for this purpose, the development of modern science or general acceptance of the theory of evolution. Moreover, the age-long quarrel between religion and Naturalism is by no means settled, nor can it be settled by any compromise or "peace without victory."

According to Nevin in Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* "It is a certain type of *Weltanschauung* which includes all types of theory which rule, or try to rule, out of consideration whatever is called 'supernatural' or 'spiritual' or transcendent of experience."

Remembering that this type of mind is an age-long foe of religion, nevertheless we are concerned in this paper with its modern presentation. And here possibly is a good place to look at the constituent elements of these "acids of modernity" which Lippmann says have dissolved the ancestral order of faith and conduct.

However it might be phrased, the doctors are generally agreed in their diagnosis that the important factor in producing the Naturalism of our day is "SCIENCE," with the common use of machinery (sometimes called Industrialism) and modern city life as contributing factors. Of course the latter two, in part at least, have been the results of the application of science and invention in our modern life. It is nothing new, however, for humanity to be herded together in large cities. To hear some of our moderns talk you would think that the city with a population of a hundred thousand is a new phenomenon. The evils as well as the temptations of city life are nothing new; and as we observe some of the antics of city folk today we are tempted to believe that the collective intelligence quotient has not varied much during the ages. I am thinking of the words in the Book of Jonah, concerning Nineveh, "that great city, wherein are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand"!

It is science that I want to talk about for the next few minutes. Rufus Jones said at the Jerusalem meeting, "I am inclined to think that there is no one thing that more impresses a man as he travels through country after country around the world than the spell which science has thrown over the minds of youth today."[3] And indeed, it is not only over youth that the spell is cast.

Now if we were to speak accurately, we should distinguish between science and the philosophies which some scientists hold; and we should note, here is the crux of the whole matter. There can be no quarrel with any scientist as long as he deals with the facts of his science. And to be sure there can be no real objection to him elaborating a philosophy which he thinks is the logical view-point deduced from his scientific observations, but here he must submit to the tests which all philosophies must face. Dean Inge is quite right when he says that the philosophy of science has not yet, as a whole, been adequately dealt with. He says, "If I am right, the materialistic monism of the last century is giving place to a spiritualistic monism which is still in a very tentative stage." I am sure, however, that Bertrand Russell would object to having his monism labeled spiritualistic. Neutral monism, I believe, suits him better. However, there are many who feel that modern science and the world-view which grows out of science have made a spiritualistic interpretation unnecessary, nay, impossible. Religion must give place to Science. When Mr. Eliot, a Humanist, raises the faint objection that he is afraid that humanity cannot get along without religion, one of the more robust of the Naturalists retorts, "It will have to!"

And so Mr. C. E. Ayres suggests that the new Apostles' Creed runs something like this:

I believe in atoms, molecules, and electrons, matter of heaven and earth, and electrical energy its only form. I believe in modern science, conceived by Copernicus and borne out by Newton; which suffered under

[3] Jerusalem meeting report, Vol. I, p. 306.

the Inquisition, was persecuted and anathematized, but rose to be the right hand of civilization as a consequence of the fact that it rules the quick and the dead. I believe in the National Research Council, the communion of scientists, the publication of discoveries, the control of nature and progress everlasting. Amen.

Well—no one can doubt but that such a creed is rather *comprehensive;* and yet, as a matter of fact, it is still *inadequate* as an interpretation of *some of the phenomena of life.* Dean Inge again gives us a fruitful suggestion: "The fact that gill-slits and a tail exist in the human embryo tells us something about the remote past of humanity, but nothing about its present or its future. It tells us nothing about Newton to know that he once had a tail!" And it is because modern science is so voluble about *origins* and so silent about some *other things which we feel need to be taken into account,* that some of us hesitate about taking its say-so on every matter under the sun. As some one has suggested, when you begin to spell a word with a capital letter it is in danger of dazzling folks with its borrowed splendor, and creating no end of mischief with their estimate of values.

These naturalists feel that everything can be reduced to a chemical element, if not a chemical formula. Mr. Bertrand Russell gravely remarks in *Whither Mankind:* "I have heard it suggested by a bio-chemist that mysticism is due to excessive alkalinity of the blood"! Another writer opines that possibly the voices which the mystics declare they have heard may be caused by a catarrhal condition of the inner ear! One is constrained to offer the suggestion, equally as scientific, that possibly *Naturalism* is caused by an excess of something in the *gall-duct!*

And so, having dissolved the God of our Fathers, modern Naturalism proceeds to build another, in the form of a machine. Do you remember that chapter in *The Education of Henry Adams* entitled "The Dynamo and the Virgin"? Here is a book which gives in full an account of how one man "got that

way"; and it remained for a contemporary, Mr. Eugene O'Neill, to present a Child of the Twentieth Century, a naturalist, worshiping at the shrine of his deity, by portraying Reuben Light, son of an old-style Christian minister, yammering and groveling before an electric generator. To such depths have many of these moderns descended in one way and another. And out of the sense of frustration which arises from the worship of such a deity come the despair and pessimism which are the natural products of such a faith—or such a lack of faith, matching the "*tedium Vitæ*" of the ancients and the *Weltschmerz* of Goethe's day.

To be sure, there are some who profess a sense of relief in being freed from the worship of the deity of the old ancestral order. There is the scorn and hatred manifested for instance by a man like Aldous Huxley:

> I'm so tired of all the rubbish about the higher life and moral and intellectual progress and living for ideals and all the rest of it. It all leads to death. Christians and moralists and cultured æsthetes and bright young scientists—all the poor little human frogs just going to pop, ceasing to be anything but the fragments of a little frog—decaying fragments at that. The whole thing is a huge stupidity, a huge disgusting lie.

There is something amusing about the seriousness of such "tired" young men, particularly when we understand what makes them so "tired," but there is also something saddening about it all, especially when we see to what an extent this attitude of mind prevails on the campuses of our colleges and universities, and when we read in our newspapers of the final dramatic, despairing gesture of young students who have been reduced to believing that "we are all little frogs, just going pop." The *tedium Vitæ* of the ancients and the *Weltschmerz* of Goethe's day can well be matched by the despair of our moderns, who with life emptied of all beauty and zest and worthy desire, sink into the pessimism so evident in Mr. Krutch's book *The Modern Temper*. He concludes as follows: "Ours is a lost cause, and there is no place for us in the natural universe, but

we are not, for all that, sorry to be human. We should rather die as men than live as animals." (A rather peculiar conclusion, by the way, to his whole philosophy of life.)

Nevertheless, must we not admit that the cheap and easy optimism of some of our religionists is especially irritating. The fatuous Polly-Anna grin on their faces as they blithely announce that "God is in his heaven! All's well with the world"—drives those who have some appreciation of *reality* to despair. Do you remember that touching incident in Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure,* where the little boy as he views the successive blows of fate which have fallen on his family, pulls at his mother's heart-strings when he says, "Mother, I ought never to have been born, ought I?" And no one, certainly no one who has ever caught the look of compassion on the Master's face as he looked out on the children of his generation and had the vision of a flock of sheep, poor, befuddled, silly creatures lost on the mountainside—no one who has ever had that vision, can fail equally to look with compassion and sympathy on this generation of ours, which, despite the apparent prosperity and general indifference of a favored few, has seen so many of its fondest dreams disappear and its highest hopes crucified. I heard Doctor Mott a few weeks ago give his impressions from a recent world-wide trip. As he detailed the misery, the physical suffering, the mental anguish and torture, the spiritual destitution of a large proportion of the children of men, my heart went sick within me, and I groaned, "O God—how long —how long!"

No—there is far more to be hoped for from the pessimism of a Barth or a Schweitzer, or even a Spengler, than in any such cheap and trashy presentation of a Christianity, as is portrayed in *The Book Nobody Knows*—or *The Man Nobody Knows.* I do not wonder nobody knows him; certainly no one who has followed those faltering steps up a green hill outside a city wall, could ever confuse him with the aspiring president of the Jerusalem Chamber of Commerce that some of the rev-

erend clergy see and preach! I do not wonder that a *Weltschmerz* fills the hearts of these who have come to the position of Huxley. What has happened to them? In losing God—they have lost all! Love has lost all real human, nay, spiritual significance. I hope you have all read Doctor Stevens' article in the CROZER QUARTERLY on the death of any nobility attaching to love for our modern naturalists. How could it be otherwise? From the ideal of the Christian home, sanctified by the love of a strong man for a tender woman and blessed by those who called them "father"—"mother," we have come to the presentation of love as given by men such as Huxley, "an obscene joke." Krutch commenting on the outcome says: "Huxley delights in mocking sentiment with physiology, to place the emotions of the lover in comic juxtaposition with quaint biological lore and to picture a romantic pair 'quietly sweating palm to palm.'" But as Krutch observes, "The joke is one which quickly turns bitter on the tongue, for a great and gratifying illusion has passed away, leaving the need for it still there."

And man is even stripped of the dignity of his suffering as he bows his head, bloody but unafraid under the hammerings of fate. Krutch says that no more real tragedies can be written. Pain, Sorrow, Frustration, yes, these will continue to be delineated as long as man endures; but there can be no more tragedies as conceived by Sophocles in his Œdipus—or as by Shakespeare in his Lear. The difference was made painfully apparent to me last fall when I saw Eugene O'Neill's "Strange Interlude." What a difference between the picture of the old king!

> A plague upon you, murderers, traitors all!
> I might have saved her; now, she's gone forever!
> Cordelia, Cordelia! Stay a little—Ha!
> What is't thou sayest? Her voice was ever soft,
> Gentle and low, an excellent thing in woman.[4]

[4] King Lear, Act IV. Scene III.

What a contrast in that picture of heroic tragedy and that given by O'Neill, as he presents the father of the girl, a professor, striding up and down the room, beaten, frustrated, jabbering his Latin! God gone, love gone, tragedy redeemed by nobility, gone; and moral sanctions, as we have been familiar with them, gone! We have come to an eclecticism in conduct which is devastating. Some months ago when it was reported to Mr. Jack Dempsey that Mr. Gene Tunney was lecturing on Shakespeare for Billy Phelps at Yale, Mr. Dempsey, with a broad grin on his face said tolerantly: "Well, if that helps his racket, it's O. K. with me; I don't go in for this Shakespeare stuff!" That broad spirit of tolerance for each other's "racket" is part and parcel of the modern scene and is the child of that philosophy of the heroine of "Strange Interlude." "I am entitled to my own happiness, and I propose to get it, nothing and no one withstanding." What a far cry from that to "For their sakes I sanctify myself"!

Well, here are some of the modes of thought and ways of living which impinge upon the life and thought of our Christianity. What is to be our reaction, what are we going to do about it after we have done what Fitch suggests is our imperative duty, namely, that of analyzing our day and generation?

We can be content with things as they are and say that it is what God wills anyway! We can look upon our faith as an esoteric possession, destined only for the few. But for the final outcome, as far as the great mass of mankind is concerned, there is little difference whether this idea is held by those devout souls who number themselves among the "144,000 redeemed," or whether it is held by a Dean Inge, with his little coterie of Christian Platonists who feel that Christianity is too difficult a thing either to be understood or lived by the common herd. I am sure that our Lord will not be satisfied with any such limitation of his saving work.

We can give ourselves to a spirit of *defeatism and despair;* giving up the battle before it is really fought. We need to

remember that this is not the first time that formidable enemies have faced Christianity and the church. " The times are very evil " has been cried in one way or another through every Christian generation. I heard Doctor Soper, of Ohio Wesleyan, say a few weeks ago, " Each age of Christianity has seemed to be in a bad way to its contemporaries! "

And we need to remember that our help is from God, not from biology or psychology or anthropology. Science, in one way, lends an ambiguous support to any kind of philosophy of religion. To my way of thinking, there is little to choose between, on the one hand, the scientist who seeks to dispose of religious problems by sending questionnaires to college freshmen and sophomores, and those queer religionists who are greatly heartened and enter their pulpits the next Sunday with alacrity when they read in the newspaper that two biologists and three psychologists have come out for God!

What is our duty as Christian leaders in this our own day and generation? We do have an intellectual responsibility, a responsibility which each changing age faces, of adapting the Christian truth to new ways of thinking and living. It demands the highest intelligence and most rigorous thought we can possibly give. Our intellectual laziness should shame us. When we consider the great crying need of the day for a presentation of our gospel in terms which can be understood —not only by " the boy following the plough " but by the man studying physics in Millikan's laboratory—to see that need, and then listen to the ecclesiastical bedtime stories told by spiritual leaders to a generation in the intellectual travail ours is in, is an experience to make the heavens weep. We agree, I suppose, with the Bishop of London when he says, " Preaching is worse than is necessary." The same gentleman, after a tour of America also made this observation: " I notice that nearly every American minister has a telephone and an automobile. I notice that comparatively few have a worth-while library." Well, we are not to count the spiritual value of a man by the

number of books he reads. Herbert Spencer it was, I think, who said in reply to the question as to whether he had read such and such a book: "No! If I read as much as some men, I would know as little as they do"! That is true, and yet I like to think of the father of Sir William Robertson Nicoll, I believe it was, a pastor away up in the highlands of Scotland, with a library of 17,000 volumes. And they were not principally Harold Bell Wright's, you may be sure.

Look at the magnificent work done by the so-called "Cumnor Group" of England, composed of men and women like Canon Streeter, the late Lily Dougall, Cyril Emmet, and a few others. They have made a contribution to Christian thought and life in England (and indeed throughout the world) especially through the "Student Christian Movement," which is incalculable. Why do not we have more of such groups, here in America. If, in this paper something might have been written which will come as a challenge to some to form themselves into similar groups and give themselves to the rigorous application of the best their minds can produce in work on some of these problems which vex men's minds and hearts, it would be "all to the good" as our English cousins would say.

Yes, we can do that. And there is one thing more we can do. Christianity is faced, not only with an intellectual problem, but also an ethical one. Some few years back Eucken the German philosopher wrote a book with the title *Can We Still Be Christian?*—that is, in the light of the changes which modern science and philosophy have wrought. I feel that the proper way of putting the challenge which comes to us is not "*Can* We Still Be Christian?" but "*Dare* We Be Christian?" In the light of the curse which modern industrialism in its objectionable forms poses for us, in the light of the animosities which our ever-increasing contacts with other people bring us, in the light of the scornful taunt which comes from the Far East, "Keep your Christianity at home," it is not "Can we be Christians?" but "Dare we be Christians?"

Here is the challenge which physicians of the soul face in a society bearing in its body the manifest signs of its acidosis —this disease of modernity. And the prescription? I think it is contained in the words so familiar yet so unintelligible even to our deepest thought; " If any man would follow me— let him deny himself." So Schweitzer in his *Civilization and Ethics* (p. 268, 269) gives us the one sure way out from cynicism, bitterness, and despair in these words:

> Open your eyes and look for some man, or some work for the sake of men, which needs a little time, a little friendship, a little sympathy, a little sociability, a little human toil. Perhaps it is a lonely person, or an embittered person, or an invalid, or some unfortunate inefficient, to whom you can be something. It may be an old man or it may be a child. Therefore search and see if there is not some place where you can invest your humanity. Do not be put off if you find that you have to wait and to experiment. Be sure that you will have disappointments to endure. But do not be satisfied without some sideline in which you may give yourself out as a man to men. There is one waiting for you if only you are willing to take it up in the right spirit. . .

And as we do this, we shall find the truth of Schweitzer's other words, " We shall find who he is."

IS THE SUNDAY SCHOOL DOOMED?

CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN

In 1906, the number of scholars enrolled in the Sunday schools of the United States constituted 17.1 per cent. of the population of the United States and 61.7 per cent. of the population of the United States between 5 and 17 years of age.

In 1916, the corresponding ratios were 19.5 per cent. and 74.2 per cent.

In 1926, they were 17.9 per cent. and 69.9 per cent.

Between 1906 and 1926 the number of scholars enrolled in Sunday schools gained eight-tenths of one per cent. on the total population of the United States and eight and two-tenths per cent. on the population of the United States between 5-17 years of age.

Between 1916 and 1926 the number of scholars enrolled in Sunday schools *declined* 1.6 per cent. with reference to the population of the United States and 4.3 per cent. with reference to the population of the United States between 5-17 years of age; whereas the decade 1906-1916 showed corresponding *increases* of 2.4 per cent. and 12.5 per cent. The retardation in rate of increase of scholars in Sunday schools for 1916-1926 as compared to the rate of increase for the preceding decade was over 30 per cent.

The decade 1916-1926 has been rather disastrous to the American Sunday school, canceling almost one-third of the gain made between 1906-1916. After two decades of terrific effort in behalf of the Sunday school, the situation in 1926 falls far short of the results anticipated. Such a state of affairs demands serious study.

The following investigation is based upon an examination of twenty-three religious groups in the United States, constituting approximately 82 per cent. of the scholars enrolled in Sunday schools and approximately 86 per cent. of church-mem-

bership. Judaism, Mormonism, Roman Catholicism, and liberal and conservative Protestant groups have been included in the survey.

The analysis is restricted to three problems: (1) The relation between reported enrolment of Sunday-school scholars and church-members in 1916 and 1926; (2) the per cent. of increase in number of Sunday school scholars and church-members 1916-1926; (3) the retardation in number of Sunday-school scholars and church-members for the decade 1916-1926 as compared to the preceding decade.

I

Ratio of Sunday-school Scholars to Church-members in 1916 and 1926

Name	*1916*	*1926*	*Decline*
1. United Brethren in Christ	115.4	99.8	15.6
2. Methodist Episcopal Church	104.1	93.0	11.1
3. Reformed Church, United States	88.3	87.2	1.1
4. United Presbyterian Church, North America	97.1	86.6	10.5
5. Northern Baptist Convention	83.5	81.6	1.9
6. Presbyterian Church in United States	87.5	81.5	6.0
7. Reformed Church in America	84.9	80.9	4.0
8. Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.	85.0	74.3	10.7
9. Seventh Day Adventists	94.3	73.0	21.3
10. Disciples	76.9	72.6	4.3
11. Methodist Episcopal Church South	79.8	72.4	7.4
12. Congregational Churches	81.9	67.7	14.2
13. Friends (Orthodox)	69.9	67.6	2.3
14. Southern Baptist Convention	61.5	66.5	-5.0
15. African Methodist Episcopal Church	56.7	52.8	3.9
16. United Lutheran Church	75.7	51.3	....
17. Universalists	56.8	45.0	11.8
18. National Baptist Convention	40.1	35.0	5.1
19. Latter Day Saints (Utah)	37.9	32.9	5.0
20. Unitarians	23.8	32.7	....
21. Protestant Episcopal Church	44.9	25.8	....
22. Roman Catholic Church	11.8	6.4	5.4
23. Jewish Congregations	....	1.7	....

Since the Unitarians, the Protestant Episcopal Church, the United Lutheran Church, and the Jewish Congregations

employed a different membership basis in 1926 and 1916, it is impossible to calculate precisely the decline in the ratio of the number of Sunday-school scholars to church-members between 1916 and 1926.

With the exception of the Southern Baptist Convention, each one of these religious groups shows a decline in relation of Sunday-school scholars to church-members for the decade 1916-1926. The Seventh Day Adventists experienced the greatest per cent. decline; the Roman Catholic Church the greatest numerical decline, namely, 659,556. During this same period the Seventh Day Adventists gained 39.8 per cent. in church-membership, and the Roman Catholic Church added 2,883,035 members to its rolls.

Not one of these groups could in 1926 boast as many scholars in Sunday school as members upon the church lists.

The Universalists, the National Baptist Convention, the Latter Day Saints (Utah), the Unitarians, the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Jewish Congregations report less than one-half as many scholars enrolled in Sunday school as members on church rolls.

More than 98 Jews out of every hundred fail to attend Sabbath school. Moreover, Judaism had only some 68,000 in its week-day religious schools in 1926. Less than seven Roman Catholics out of every hundred are enrolled in the Sunday schools of that church. Almost fifty per cent. of Roman Catholic children between 5 and 17 years of age attend the parochial schools. The Latter Day Saints have three times as many church-members as Sunday-school scholars.

At least fourteen groups, namely, Seventh Day Adventists, National Baptist Convention, Congregational Churches, Jewish Congregations, Mormons, United Lutheran Church, African Methodist Episcopal Church, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., United Presbyterian Church of North America, Protestant Episcopal Church, Reformed Church in America, Roman Catholic Church, United Brethren in Christ, and Universalists,

report a decline in ratio of Sunday-school scholars to church-members for 1926 as compared with 1906. At least nine groups, namely, the National Baptist Convention, the Congregational Churches, the Jewish Congregations, the Mormons, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Reformed Church in America, and the Universalists, report a continuous decline 1906-1926 in relation of Sunday-school scholars to church-members.

II

Per Cent. Increase in Sunday-school Scholars and Church-members, 1916-1926

Sunday-school Scholars		*Church-membership*	
1. Southern Baptist Convention	40.8	1. Seventh Day Adventists	39.8
2. Presbyterian Church, United States	17.4	2. Latter Day Saints	34.4
3. Latter Day Saints (Utah)	16.8	3. Southern Baptist Convention	30.1
4. Seventh Day Adventists	8.2	4. Presbyterian Church United States	26.1
5. United Lutheran Church	7.2	5. Roman Catholicism	18.3
6. Methodist Episcopal Church, South	6.7	6. Methodist Episcopal Church, South	17.7
7. Disciples of Christ	6.1	7. Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.	16.5
8. Jewish Congregations	5.8	8. Disciples	12.4
9. Reformed Church, United States	3.6	9. Methodist Episcopal Church	9.8
10. Northern Baptist Convention	1.1	10. Congregational Churches	9.0
11. Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.	1.06	11. National Baptist Convention	8.8
12. Reformed Church in America	0.9	12. United Brethren in Christ	8.2
13. Unitarians	.002	13. United Presbyterian Church, North America	6.7
14. Methodist Episcopal Church.	–1.9	14. Reformed Church in America	6.0
15. Protestant Episcopal Church.	–1.9	15. Reformed Church in U. S.	4.9
16. Friends (Orthodox)	–4.2	16. Northern Baptist Convention	3.6
17. United Presbyterian Church, North America	–4.7	17. African Methodist Episcopal Church	–0.5
18. National Baptist Convention.	–5.07	18. Friends (Orthodox)	–1.1
19. United Brethren in Christ	–6.4	19. Universalists	–6.2
20. African Methodist Episcopal Church	–7.3	20. Jewish Congregations [1]	
21. Congregational Churches	–9.6	21. United Lutheran Church [1]	
22. Universalists	–25.6	22. Protestant Episcopal Church [1]	
23. Roman Catholics	–35.4	23. Unitarians [1]	

[1] Change in basis of membership.

With the exception of the Southern Baptist Convention, the per cent. increase in number of church-members was greater than that of Sunday-school scholars.

Only three denominations, namely, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the Friends, and the Universalists, report a decrease in number of church-members; but ten denominations, namely, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Friends, the United Presbyterian Church of North America, the National Baptist Convention, the United Brethren in Christ, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the Congregational Churches, the Universalists, and the Roman Catholics report a decrease in number of Sunday-school scholars.

At the present rate of decrease it would seem that the Roman Catholic Sunday school will become extinct a few decades hence.

While the Methodist Episcopal Church, the United Presbyterian Church of North America, the National Baptist Convention, the United Brethren in Christ, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the Congregational Churches, and the Universalists were *losing* 234,465 Sunday-school scholars, they were *adding* 732,549 church-members to their rolls.

While the Roman Catholic Church *was losing* 659,556 scholars, it *was adding* 2,883,035 members.

While the National Baptist Convention *was losing* 59,908 Sunday-school scholars, it *was adding* 258,044 members.

While the Methodist Episcopal Church *was losing* 75,703 Sunday-school scholars, it *was adding* 362,992 members.

The median for increase in Sunday-school scholars was 0.9 per cent.

The median for increase in church-members was nine per cent.; ten times as large!

III

Retardation in Number of Sunday-school Scholars and Church-members for 1916-1926 as Compared with 1906-1916

Sunday-school Scholars		*Church-membership*	
1. Roman Catholic	61.0	1. Latter Day Saints	52.5
2. Disciples	56.9	2. National Baptist Convention	21.1
3. Methodist Episcopal Church, South	55.6	3. Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.	19.8
4. United Brethren in Christ	50.9	4. United Brethren in Christ	18.8
5. Presbyterian Church, U. S.	47.1	5. United Presbyterian Church, North America	16.6
6. Methodist Episcopal Church	45.2	6. Methodist Episcopal Church	14.7
7. Seventh Day Adventists	40.8	7. Reformed Church, U. S.	12.8
8. Friends (Orthodox)	39.8	8. Disciples of Christ	12.4
9. United Presbyterian Church of North America	39.3	9. Methodist Eispcopal Church, South	11.4
10. Reformed Church, U. S.	33.2	10. African Methodist Episcopal Church	11.3
11. National Baptist Convention	32.77	11. Reformed Church in America	10.1
12. Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.	30.74	12. Presbyterian Church, U. S.	8.2
13. Jewish Congregations	28.5	13. Northern Baptist Convention	6.2
14. United Lutheran Church	24.2	14. Southern Baptist Convention	4.2
15. Southern Baptist Convention.	23.3	15. Friends (Orthodox)	2.4
16. Latter Day Saints	18.3	16. Congregational Churches	1.1
17. African Methodist Episcopal Church	13.5	17. Universalists	–2.1
18. Northern Baptist Convention	12.4	18. Roman Catholicism	–7.6
19. Congregational Churches	11.6	19. Seventh Day Adventists	–12.3
20. Protestant Episcopal Church.	7.2	20. Jewish Congregations [1]	
21. Universalists	4.5	21. United Lutheran Church [1]	
22. Reformed Church in America	1.0	22. Protestant Episcopal Church [1]	
23. Unitarians	–18.0	23. Unitarians [1]	

The corresponding rate of retardation in United States population was 4 per cent. and in United States population between 5 and 17 years of age, nine-tenths of one per cent.

The Southern Baptist Convention rate of retardation in church members, namely 4.2 per cent., most closely parallels the United States rate.

The Latter Day Saints (Utah) show a rate of retardation in church-membership thirteen times that of the population of the United States.

[1] Change in basis of membership.

Only the Friends, Congregational Churches, Universalists, Roman Catholics, and Seventh Day Adventists report an acceleration with reference to increase in United States population as far as church-membership is concerned.

Turning now to the retardation in Sunday-school scholars, it is evident how serious the situation is. The Unitarians succeeded in checking the decline for the preceding decade. All communions with the exception of Unitarians and Reformed Church in America, report a greater retardation in Sunday-school enrolment than that which occurred in case of United States population.

The retardation in number of Sunday-school scholars in case of the Disciples was 63 times that of United States population between 5 and 17 years of age, and 14 times that of United States population.

The median rate of retardation in number of Sunday-school scholars was 34 times that of United States population between 5 and 17 years of age, and 7.5 times that of total United States population.

Eleven denominations reported a retardation in number of Sunday-school scholars at least eight times as large as that of the population of the United States and at least 36 times as large as that of population of the United States between 5-17 years of age.

Only the Latter Day Saints (Utah) and Reformed Church in America show a larger rate of retardation for church-membership than for Sunday-school scholars.

IV

Some Observations

1. Only one out of every three church-members and one out of every six inhabitants of the United States is reported as enrolled in the Sunday schools of the United States. If attendance is one-half of the number of enrolled scholars, possibly

one out of every twelve persons in the United States comes somewhat under the influence of the program of the Sunday school. If one-third of the number attending Sunday school may be regarded as interested in the lesson from week to week, one out of every thirty-six persons in the United States is being deeply influenced by the curriculum of the Sunday school.

2. The retardation in Sunday-school scholars occurred during 1916-1926. During this decade religious education was carried on more intelligently and more intensively; the curricula were more in tune with the modern environment; the educational level of Sunday-school teachers was higher; the approach to the child mind was more scientific. Is a smaller church group receiving better religious instruction, while the number untouched by religious education is steadily increasing?

3. The attitude toward church-membership seems to differ from the attitude toward attendance upon the Sunday school. The membership of churches may grow although their Sunday schools are disintegrating. Are we facing a growing indifference on the part of many members of Christian churches toward their religious educational programs? Are they looking elsewhere for their religious education?

4. Is the situation temporary? Is the decline due to the World War, the automobile, increasing industrialization, the trend toward the city, the establishment of Week-day Religious Instruction and the Daily Vacation Bible School, and such like? Will acceleration replace retardation when the first reaction is over?

5. Is a new religious attitude slowly forming in the United States? Are Sunday-school statistics an accurate measuring-rod for the strength of the religious life? Are the values of religion reaching the American mind in other ways than the direct method of the Sunday school? Religious interest has been greater during the last decade than for some time as the controversy within the denominations and the bitter criticism of Christianity abundantly testify. Are the daily press, the

weekly and monthly secular magazines, the countless books involving religion, articles on health, addresses at clubs of all varieties, Papini, Ludwig, novelists of all types—to mention a few factors in the situation—bringing religion to more people directly or indirectly than the ordinary organizations of the church are?

6. The American Sunday school does not suffice for the religious education of American youth. And the other formal adventures along this line touch only a fringe of the Sunday-school population. The American Sunday school needs much indirect assistance. The one agency that touches the great bulk of American children is the public school. The hope for character education is there. Probably the veteran schoolmaster, to whom Jacks refers, was right:

> Not long ago I met one of our great schoolmasters—a veteran in that high service. "Where in your time-table do you teach religion?" I asked him. "We teach it all day long," he replied. "We teach it in arithmetic, by accuracy. We teach it in language, by learning to say what we mean—yea, yea, and nay, nay. We teach it in history, by humanity. We teach it in geography by breadth of mind. We teach it in handicraft, by thoroughness. We teach it in astronomy, by reverence. We teach it in the playground, by fair play. We teach it in kindness to animals, by courtesy to servants, by good manners to one another, and by truthfulness in all things. We teach it by showing children that we, their elders, are their friends and not their enemies."

AN INTERESTING EXPERIMENT IN WEEK-DAY RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

IVAN G. GRIMSHAW
Director of Flint School of Religion, Flint, Michigan

In recent years the public mind has become unusually active on the question of religious education. Religious ideals and motives are being recognized as fundamentally important in the development not only of the individual, but of the community as well. Religion must have a vital place in the educational provision made for childhood and youth. "Where there is no vision, the people perish," is as true today as when first uttered. Religion is the great determiner of vision and of vital importance to development.

The failure to provide for religion in our scheme of education has long been recognized by a few of the more far-sighted leaders, but it is only in recent years that the facts have begun to impress themselves upon the multitude. Ignorance of the Bible was especially brought to light by the publication of two, now famous documents: *The Army and Religion,* the report of a British Interdenominational Committee, and *Religion Among American Men,* published by the American Committee on the War and Religious Outlook. Both of the documents were agreed in calling attention to the extraordinary and lamentable ignorance on the part of soldiers as to Christianity, its nature, its meaning, and purpose. The fact that such deficiency was often found on the part of those who had been regular in attendance at church and Sunday school pointed to the fact that one of the great deficiencies of the church has been its failure to provide for the religious education of youth.

Since that day many surveys of various groups of young people have been made with equally astonishing results. Youth is not being reached by religious teaching, and some provision must be made for it if the nation is to remain a truly Christian

nation. In the surveys of the Interchurch World Movement it was revealed that although in America there were 8,676,000 Roman Catholic children under the age of twenty-five, of that number only 1,870,000 or 21.6 per cent. were being reached by the religious education program of the parochial school. The Jewish people fared even worse, having 1,630,000 children, of which number only 87,000 or 4.18 per cent. were being touched by the synagogue school. By the traditional Protestant method of religious instruction in the Sunday school only 14,361,000 or 33.5 per cent. out of a possible 42,892,000 were being reached. Thus seven out of every ten children in the United States were not being touched by any type of educational program through the church.

The situation is still more appalling when the amount of time devoted to religious instruction is considered. The Roman Catholic parochial schools have a religious educational program of 220 hours per year. The Jews, in turn, have a program which provides for 330 hours of religious instruction. The average Protestant youth in the Sunday school receives an average of only about 15 hours per year, and the highest possible Sunday-school provision under ordinary conditions is only about 25 hours per year. Thus we are faced with this situation:

While the public school provides 1,000 hours of instruction

The Sunday school provides but 25 hours

All of these facts have driven home to the thinking people of the country the following truth: That the traditional Sunday-school approach, even at its best, is inadequate. As the scope of the task of religious education has become more and more clear it has become evident that the Sunday school must

be supplemented in a large measure by the work of other agencies. Hence the present development of Week-day Religious Education.

Week-day Religious Education simply means that phase of the church's educational program which is carried out on week-days in coordination with the public school. It may be done in three ways: (1) Through the principle of "released time" from the public-school day, a principle which is legal in most of the States in the Union; (2) carried on outside of public-school hours; (3) taught in public-school buildings, during public-school hours, by teachers provided by the churches or some other agency. The growth of week-day instruction has been tremendous. Just how many schools are in operation it would be difficult to say as no adequate statistics are available later than those published by Lotz in his *Current Week-Day Religious Education.*

It is the purpose of this article to give a description of one school which, making use of the third way, has found a method of meeting the needs of the community. The Flint School of Religion of Flint, Michigan, came into being in 1921 as an organization to meet a felt need. A group of public-spirited citizens of Flint, who were conscious of the fact that "the greatest failure of the nineteenth century has been the failure of religious education" and that in a great industrial community inadequate provision had been made for the religious life of its children, determined to remedy the situation.

The first thing done was to provide a Board of Directors consisting of fifteen members. Under the direction of this board a budget was determined and was raised by obtaining pledges from those interested in such a work. With the money thus raised a teacher was employed who began giving courses in the Central High School of the city.

As the movement came to be known, and the interest of the community aroused, the work was extended to both senior high schools, to all of the junior high schools, as well as into the

junior college of the city. The budget was correspondingly increased so that it was made possible to provide a paid director for the work, and a teacher for the junior high schools. Some idea of the growth of the movement can be gained from the fact that for each pupil enrolled in 1921, there were twenty-two enrolled in 1928.

Great care has always been taken in the selection of teachers, the demand being made that every teacher be well equipped not only in the field of religious education but also in the field of secular education. Text-books are provided by the board of the School of Religion, and the quality of work is as high as that in any other part of the public school. All courses are elective; in the senior high schools by the pupils themselves, and in the junior high schools by permission of the parent which is obtained on a special card sent home with the pupil previous to registration.

The aim of the school may be stated as follows:

1. To make religious instruction an integral part of education.
2. To make religious instruction accessible to all children.
3. To provide more time for such instruction.
4. To insure frequency and continuity of instruction.
5. To maintain high academic standards.
6. To give new importance to religious education in the minds of pupils, parents, and the community as a whole.
7. To lead pupils to: (a) know God; (b) appreciate Jesus and his way of life; (c) understand and use the Bible; (d) live in accordance with the highest possible religious principles.

The following courses are offered:

Junior College

Bible Literature I. 2 hours per week. (First Semester.)

The Bible as Literature. A study of the Prophetic books of the Old Testament, along with Psalms and Job, with a view

to gaining an appreciation of the literary values. Certain passages, noted for their beauty, are especially stressed.

Bible Literature II. 2 hours per week. (Second Semester.)

The Bible as Literature. A further study of the literature of the Bible with special emphasis upon the values to be derived from the great books of the New Testament.

(Although a continuation of Course I, this course may be taken alone.)

Senior High School

Bible Literature I. 5 hours per week. (First Semester.)

History of the Hebrews. A survey of Hebrew History from the time of the Exodus until the time of Christ. The special emphasis of the course is upon the religious and social ideals of the Hebrews as they found expression in the Bible.

Bible Literature II. 5 hours per week. (Second Semester.)

The Life and Teachings of Jesus. An attempt, by means of modern historical and literary methods, to present to the pupil a vital picture of Jesus, his teachings, and the need of their application in modern times.

Bible Literature III. 5 hours per week. (First Semester.)

The Bible as Literature. A study of the books of Law, History, and Prophecy in the Old Testament, with a view to gleaning from them the valuable lessons which they present as pieces of literary excellence.

Bible Literature IV. 5 hours per week. (Second Semester.)

The Bible as Literature. A study of the great books of didactic and lyric poetry, with a view to discovering the great teachings there recorded. Also a consideration of the books of the New Testament with special emphasis upon the beauty of the teachings of Jesus.

(Although a continuation of Course III, this course may be taken alone.)

Religious Education I. 2½ hours per week. (First Semester.)

Religious Drama and Pageantry. A study of the fundamentals underlying the writing and production of both Biblical and non-Biblical religious dramas and pageants. A study is also made of some of the more recent religious dramas with a view to preparing young people for leadership in the churches.

Religious Education II. 2½ hours per week. (Second Semester.)

Leadership in Young People's Work. A study is made of the organization and methods of conducting young people's worship groups such as C. E., B. Y. P. U., Epworth League, Tuxis, etc., with a view to preparing young people for leadership and participation in such groups in the churches of the city.

Junior High School

Bible Literature I. 1 hour per week. (First Semester.)

The Life and Teachings of Jesus. A narrative study of the life of Jesus, stressing especially his teachings and their place in modern life.

Bible Literature II. 1 hour per week. (Second Semester.)

The Life of Paul. A study of the life and heroism of Paul as an inspiration to the noblest living today.

Is the work worth while? Decidedly so! One of the most interesting features is the fact that the work is being provided for children who come from greatly varying backgrounds as to doctrinal outlook. The school is providing for Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, although the latter two groups are much in the minority. A still more interesting fact, however, is that the four hundred children enrolled in these courses last semester represented over eighty churches and more than twenty different denominations. There are representatives of a great many of the " tangential " groups such as Church of God, Assembly of God, Nazarene, Pentecostal, Spiritualistic, Christian Science,

etc. The great majority of the children come, of course, from the larger denominations. A brief list of the main groups is interesting to note:

	Senior High School	*Junior High School*
Methodist	.432%	.315%
Presbyterian	.170%	.121%
Baptist	.068%	.089%
Catholic	.011%	.089%
Evangelical	.034%	.031%
Methodist Protestant	.011%	.024%
Jewish	.000%	.004%
No church affiliation	.090%	.117%

The table shows that the percentage of Catholics in the junior high schools is as great as that of the Baptists. The Jewish group is not nearly so well represented. However, Flint has a very low percentage of Jewish population.

It is interesting that such a large number of pupils are being reached who are not otherwise touched by the church or Sunday school. The reaching of this group alone would seem to justify the existence of the project. Certainly any movement which is such a splendid example of Christian unity is of value to any community.

There are other indications of worth, however. One pastor recently expressed himself as follows:

"I am thoroughly convinced that it (Flint School of Religion) constitutes the most important religious move that has been undertaken in our community in the last quarter of a century."

A parent of some of the children has this testimony to bear: "Since our three children have been receiving instruction in the week-day schools the Christian Spirit has been growing in our home."

Does it pay? Without doubt! The week-day movement has arisen to meet a felt need and, in the opinion of the writer,

it is this movement in its various phases which will write religion large on the heart of the American nation. Not every community can do it in the same way. Adaptations must be made. New ways of working will be discovered. America is a Christian nation and to hold true to her ideals religion must be given its rightful place in the education of every American child. As Calvin Coolidge has so aptly stated:

"We cannot remind ourselves too often that our right to be free, the support of our principles of justice, our obligations to each other in our domestic affairs, and our duty to humanity abroad, the confidence in each other necessary to support our social and economic relations, and finally the fabric of our government itself, *rests upon religion.*"

WHAT HAPPENED AT PENTECOST?

President MILTON G. EVANS

THE most significant fact in contemporary history is the Christian church. The church, whatever its doctrines and organization may have been when its earliest adherents called themselves "disciples," or "brethren," or "the Way," or "believers," has given direction to and modified all racial groups it has touched during nineteen centuries. It has occasioned frequent regrouping of peoples into new nationalities; it has furnished the ideals and supplied the materials for new types of culture in varied geographical zones; it has been the inspiration and driving power in attaining successively higher moral levels; in brief, contemporary history is essentially Christian history. This is true even in India and China and Africa. It will be increasingly true of these centers of population as the years pass. It is not strange, then, that the suggestion to celebrate the nineteen-hundredth anniversary of the birth of the church has appealed to the imagination of all sections of Christendom. The celebration itself may reproduce most if not all the happenings of Pentecost, frequently called "the birthday of the Christian Church," whatever its precise date may have been.

It is conceivable that hymns may be inspired that have power to evoke from a worshiping throng incoherent cries of praise and thanksgiving, and the hymns themselves convey no intelligible meaning, yet persist for generations as appropriate vehicles of religious emotion. It is conceivable, too, that sermons may be preached that shall so sting the conscience for social misdeeds, only too obvious when recited, and for personal wrong-doing known only to the listener, that whole communities may abandon their prevailing vices. It may happen also that some Christian historian may review the history of the whole Christian movement and interpret it in so simple

and penetrating a fashion as to win an abiding place in subsequent literature as a source of knowledge and inspiration for conduct. At any rate, on one memorial day[1] an early Christian was inspired to write one piece of literature that remains to this day the classic apocalyptic interpretation of the significance of Jesus in cosmic history. Or, again, it is conceivable that some cripple, longing for cure, may on the Pentecostal celebration leap to his feet and shout for joy, or some blind man receive his sight, or some deaf and dumb may hear and speak again. Abandoned crutches, braces, eye-glasses, ear-trumpets, and discarded physicians' prescriptions, may be mute but incontrovertible testimony of healing in some sacred place. All these may happen again at some Pentecostal celebration this year. If not, why not? Who can predict the possibilities of the unplumbed deeps of human emotion, or forecast the issues latent in human personality?

But suppose the audible and visible and mathematical calculable effects at Pentecost nineteen hundred years ago should be reproduced in every detail, would they tell the story of what happened on that eventful day? Eloquent tongues have vividly portrayed the external phenomena. Imaginative writers have with the magic of words visualized the scene in minutest detail, so that sympathetic readers become listeners to a by-stander's coarse joke and Peter's calm interpretation. Indeed, it may be that some enterprising genius may conceive a realistic reproduction of the scene described by Luke, and by use of modern mechanism enable an audience to hear "a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind"; to see "tongues parting asunder, like as of fire"; to see the crowds gathering from the narrow streets leading to the place; to hear their comments of wonder and perplexity; to listen in rapt attention to the exact words of Peter as recorded in Acts. If this should be done, it would be an honest attempt to reproduce the "historical situation." But even though such an attempt at celebration might be a

[1] The Revelation 1: 18.

complete success as far as ocular and auditory conditions are concerned, would any cry of repentance be heard from the modern audience? If not, why not? The answer is obvious. The experiences of speaker and hearer cannot be reproduced. The declaimer of Peter's speech has not had Peter's experience with Jesus; no one present has been assured that he has seen the Risen Lord; not one of the hearers has seen the three hanging on the cross, and heard the "seven words" of the central One, and perchance actually cried, "Crucify him; crucify him!" The psychical states of men living fifty days after the crime in which the great majority, if not all, in varying degrees, were participants, cannot be those of men who live nineteen hundred years after. The statement, "And there were added in that day about three thousand souls," was intended to be a statement of fact; whether the fact was regarded as a marvel by the historian is another question. Considering all the circumstances, it is equally a wonder that there were not more. Were there only three thousand of the possibly one hundred thousand who crowded Jerusalem on that day ready to disavow the charge of their accuser, "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified"? This Jesus whom *ye crucified!* What happened at Pentecost was something more significant than a large addition to the earlier group, though this itself was of great significance. It meant much, as subsequent history discloses, to have a group multiply itself by twenty-five in so short a time. Pentecost cannot be adequately described by the qualities of Peter's speech or the numerical results of the complex situation. These are as external as the tongues, like as of fire, and the sound as of the rushing mighty wind.

But it was a great and notable day! Peter declares it to be "That great and notable day"—a veritable "Day of the Lord." An earlier prophet, using the customary mode of symbolic speech, described a future momentous change in God's

activity in human history. He anticipated the day when God will disclose himself not only to members of the prophetic order, but to all persons within the Israelitish commonwealth: [2]

> And after these things I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh;
> And your sons and your daughters will prophesy,
> Your old men will dream dreams,
> Your young men will see visions:
> And also upon the servants and upon the handmaidens in those days will I pour out my Spirit.
> And I will place signs in heaven and on earth,
> Blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke.
> The sun will be turned to darkness,
> And the moon to blood,
> Before the coming of the great and terrible day of Jehovah.
> And every one who calls on the name of Jehovah will be delivered:
> For in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there will be a remnant, as Jehovah has spoken,
> And among the fugitives those whom Jehovah calls.

Peter and his companions were convinced that in their experience a new and divine force had been introduced into history. They could not deny that in the person of Jesus of Nazareth God had made his power and presence felt in an unmistakable way. They unhesitatingly adopted Old Testament language to describe the marvelous revolution that was taking place in their conception of Jehovah and his purposes. They found no more fitting language to express their convictions of the fact of change both of themselves and of Jesus. They themselves were prophets inspired by Jehovah—all of them, young and old, male and female, master and slave; Jesus the crucified was exalted by the right hand of God to sit by his side. The change was so marked that it was as though the sun were turned to darkness and the moon into blood, so that Peter puts the old expectation by the side of the new historical assurance, and identifies them by the words, "This is that which hath been spoken by the prophet Joel." [3]

[2] Acts 10: 38. [3] Joel 2: 28-32.

What happened, then, at Pentecost? It is quite customary to call it the birthday of the church. Certainly it was not the birthday of the church conceived as an organization composed of members grouped as accepting well-defined beliefs and properly officered. Their distinguishing mark is described as a *togetherness.* The attractive power that brought them together was similarity of experience during preceding days. The organizing principle within the group was loyalty to one whom they had learned to love and whose love and loyalty could not be destroyed by death. They knew that they had acquired a new moral dynamic in themselves and for society, and they knew that they had received this power from Jesus.[4] The "birthday" of the church is just as significant as any birthday, no more, no less. Whatever the day of birth may have been, it simply marks the culmination of processes during the period of gestation and the fitting of an organism to function in a totally new environment. This is the real significance of the so-called predictive element in the Scriptures, both Old and New. Without the silent years preceding the first cry of the infant and the marvelously rapid adjustment of its organism to an independent life with all future possibilities, the birth itself is impossible. What was born at Pentecost was not a new social organization, so much as a new loyalty, which should in time organize itself so as to function with life-giving power in every environment. Prenatal processes reached a climactic crisis on that day, so suddenly and so dramatically as to be virtually the birthday of a new individual autonomy, a new social autonomy, and a new object of loyalty.

1. *A New Individual Autonomy.* The principle of individualism is a human principle. It is self-assertiveness without which human worth is impossible. As early as human history can be traced there appears a clash between the individual unit and the social unit, or tribe. There have always been rebels against the established order. The rebels have been the

[4] John 20: 21-23.

race's herald of a new day; they have been the pioneers in human adventure into unexplored territories. Such insubordinates are most marked in the field of religion, since in this realm they claim to speak with the authority of God. This is the climax of self-assertiveness in opposition to other humans. This is the distinctive characteristic of the Hebrew prophets. It is the assertion of the authority of individual moral perception over against that of the state. Greek history illustrates the principle in the dramatists. Pre-Pentecostal Sophocles illustrates it in his *Antigone*. Creon, king of Thebes, had forbidden the burial of Polynices, and had announced the penalty of public stoning upon any one who would violate his edict. Antigone, the sister of Polynices, plans to bury her brother, and asks her sister Ismene to aid her.

ANTIGONE: Think, will you share my toil and strife?

ISMENE: In what bold deed? What is your plan?

ANTIGONE: To try if you with this hand's help will raise that body.

ISMENE: What! Bury him? In opposition to the state?

ANTIGONE: My brother, though, and yours. If you refuse, I will be found no traitor.

ISMENE: Reckless! When Creon too forbids?

ANTIGONE: 'Tis not for him to keep me from mine own.

Antigone is caught in the act of performing funeral rites over the exposed body of her dead brother, and is brought before Creon, who asks:

Do you acknowledge or deny you did this thing?

ANTIGONE: I say I did it. I deny not that I did it.

CREON: Tell me, not at full length, but briefly, did you know my edict against doing this?

ANTIGONE: I did. How could I help it? It was plain.

CREON: Yet you presumed to transgress law?

ANTIGONE: Yes, for it was not Zeus who gave this edict; nor yet did Justice, dwelling with the gods below, make for men laws like these. I did not think that such force was in your edicts that the unwritten and unchanging laws of God you, a mere man, could traverse. These are not matters of today or yesterday, but are from everlasting. No man can

tell at what time they appeared. In view of them I would not, through fear of human will, wrest judgment from the gods.[5]

In Greece, Sophocles, practically contemporary with Ezekiel, like Ezekiel, affirms the autonomy of the individual in contrast with social solidarity, and true to his conception of personal worth, regardless of sex, represents a woman as claiming the authority of God for her conduct. Antigone in Thebes antedates Peter and John in Jerusalem by about five centuries, but she is their contemporary in spirit, when they, with equal defiance say, " Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye." The difference is, that before Pentecost, Antigone and her kind in Greece and Ezekiel and his likeminded prophets were the exception; after Pentecost they were to become the normal. On that day Peter perceived that all his followers in Israel were privileged equally with him to be recipients of divine revelation. Every person had become his own judge of duty; all persons were equally competent to receive intimations of the divine will. No authority higher than self, for God had enthroned himself in the human self. This conviction born that day gave a new sense of worth to persons, and the persons who felt the thrill of the new value made early church history and all subsequent history. This is illustrated in Luke, the Gentile physician, who in reviewing the half-century since the public ministry of Jesus, calls the roll of men and women, Jews and Gentiles, bond and free, who contributed to the growth of the church, and can explain the facts in no other way than by saying that they were filled with the Holy Spirit. Fishermen and tax-gatherer, physician and other persons whose names or occupations are unknown, became the creators of new social agencies and authors of new types of literature to make permanent in history the conviction that God is no respecter of persons. Since Pentecost no individual or group of individuals

[5] Antigone of Sophocles. George H. Palmer's translation. P. 48f.

can claim the right of sovereignty over the conscience of another, even though the other may be deemed the destroyer of all that his contemporaries hold dear.

2. *Birth of a New Social Autonomy.* Personal freedom has its hazards. The earliest Christians soon made this discovery. Each claiming to be led by the Spirit could easily identify personal desires with the Spirit's direction. The nature of human organism makes this inevitable. It is not easy to analyze the sources of desires and volitions; nor gauge the motives of conduct. The sudden and unexpected and consciously unwilled thoughts and acts are believed to be rooted elsewhere than in self, and that elsewhere is in what men call the supernatural or the "spiritual." The suppression of self-consciousness was supposed to be the negation of the human and an unmistakable pressure of the divine; so that one possessing the gift of tongues came to be considered preeminently "spiritual." The conception is that of power incalculable and uncontrolled which occasions the feeling of awe and wonder. Power characterized spirit. To show the spirit's power, or in some way to have a spirit's help, is to increase the individual's power. It adds to his prestige in a community; it gives him an advantage over his fellows. The gift of the Spirit may intensify the already exaggerated egotism of a member of a community, and make him a menace to the social order. The only safeguard is the character of the one who desires the gift, and the conceived character of the Spirit as Holy. And the earliest Christian group had members who were babes in moral attainment and ignorant of the true character of the Holy Spirit. But whatever their emotional instability, or their intellectual perceptions, or their volitional power, they had experiences of the marvelous, the unexpected, the inexplicable. With an exaggerated emphasis on the occasional effects, it was natural that the most factious, contentious, and immoral of the early groups should think itself specially spiritual. The phenomenon of speaking in tongues was like the ecstasy of

the heathen worship with which the Corinthian converts were familiar, and in which no doubt at one time many of them shared. Under the influence of the frenzy of the priests of Bacchus and Cybele, or of the howling Corybantes, many of the Christians at Corinth had, in days prior to their conversion, given expression to unintelligible cries. Their conduct had been beyond their control. "Ye know that when ye were Gentiles ye were carried away to dumb idols, in whatever way ye were led." [6]

On account of the excitement attending the rise of the new religious movement, some new converts lost control of themselves, and expressed their feelings in ecstatic shouts. Their teacher warns them of the danger of such practises, since in unguarded moments they may call Jesus accursed. But speaking in tongues may be a rapturous expression of prayer and praise to God, and therefore evidence of divine inspiration. Accordingly, no one must presume to forbid to speak with tongues.[7] Individualism guaranteed by God to all at Pentecost must not be suppressed even though it may be unseemly. At Jerusalem they were thought to be filled with new wine; at Corinth they could easily be deemed crazy. At any cost, in Christianity, the individual must have a chance for self-expression.

Again, those from another environment and with thorn roots in the soil joined the new group with little apprehension of its character and its sense of value. They were attracted by the physical effects apparent in the new movement. They were more impressed by healing, by prophecy, by speaking in tongues, than by suppression of bodily and mental vices and the cultivation of Christian virtues. Or, to use a later characterization of the Spirit's effects, they valued "gifts" more than "fruits." Christians generally believed in the fact of both gifts and fruits, but the many thought that spectacular

[6] 1 Corinthians 12: 2.
[7] 1 Corinthians 14: 39.

gifts were the more evident proofs of the Spirit's presence. Since physical effects appeal to man's love of the sensational and can be turned to personal advantage, they may be more coveted than the Spirit's fruits, which appeal only to desire for righteousness of character. Simon Magus may be taken as the type of those that valued gifts; Paul represents those that valued fruits; between these two extremes were disciples of every degree of spiritual insight. There was great danger to the group when a sorcerer could be admitted, and possibly have his power intensified. Even so, the remedy was not to deny him the power, but to correct his thinking and redirect his purposes.

Evidently the doctrine of individual autonomy had its perils leading to the possibility of many teachers, each claiming the privilege; many prophets, each announcing a different message; many ministries, each assuming the preeminence; many interpretations of social obligation, each vindicating his own view; and all claiming to be guided by the Spirit. It is no wonder, that some were disposed to become cynical, others to ridicule; and others to forbid certain others to teach, or to prophesy, or to minister, or to suggest values of conduct. At least the situation was such in Thessalonica as to lead Paul to exhort bluntly: "Quench not the Spirit; despise not prophesyings; prove all things; hold fast that which is good; abstain from every form of evil." [8]

The remedy for all possible evils that might arise in consequence of the gift of the Spirit to each in the group is found in the nature of the group itself. It is described by Luke: "And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching, and in the fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and the prayers." [9] The primitive group was not anarchism. There were centripetal forces that drew autonomous individuals into subordination to the ideals of the group. "With one accord" is the phrase

[8] 1 Thessalonians 5: 20, 21.
[9] Acts 2: 42.

repeatedly used to describe the early association of disciples. It was the accord of a schoolroom where teachers had something significant to impart and pupils were eager to learn. Learners wished to ascertain the reasons for that faith which first came to them in the rush of overwhelming emotion. None but eye-and-ear witnesses could satisfy their need. Emotion must be stabilized into sentiments and sentiments made permanent by grounding them in reality. The autonomy of the group was secured by accord of beliefs, mediated by those who knew. A "peculiar but frequent description of membership" [10] is Luke's phrase, "All that believed together." [11] The autonomous units autonomously recognized the inequality of experience and of privilege and of responsibility. By apostolic instruction the unorganized community was creating for itself the means by which it could become a permanent power in the world. The primitive teaching had in it the germs of all subsequent beliefs, even the belief that the community may deny the autonomy of the individual. The recognized authority of teachers was a safeguard against the anarchy of exaggerated individualism.

Another fruit of Pentecost was the "fellowship." A warm and joyous sense of companionship marked them off from their fellows. They were so sure of their future and of their own love each for the other, that they held their property in common. The obligation was that of spontaneous regard for others, not that imposed by the arbitrary majority or by enforced common consent. The Fellowship was held together by an ideal in which the group was not lost in the individual, nor the individual in the group. "The community was set high above, while the service and help to be rendered to the community remained a matter of individual conscience and free bounty." [12] The autonomy of the Fellowship was moral.

[10] Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 45.
[11] Acts 2: 44.
[12] Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 48; Acts 5: 4f.

The love in those early days was so genuine and disinterested that for an insincere member to become one of the number was to incur the danger of death. The guilty conscience of the individual could not endure the white light of the community conscience; and the community conscience found its best expression in the man who could sell his property for the sake of his poorer brethren. He set the standard for others in his own day and for all days. Pentecost created a new type of fellowship that illustrates a new social ethic which conserves autonomy and social solidarity. Its classic exposition was subsequently given by a man who early joined the Fellowship.[13]

3. *A New Object of Loyalty.* But the boldness of Peter and John before the Sanhedrin and the closely-knit fellowship of believers were conditioned by a loyalty to One who had been rejected by constituted authority both ecclesiastical and political. This One is the explanation of all the events that occurred. The phenomena on Pentecost, whatever their explanation, are the "therefore" of the reigning Jesus.[14] He had already become the supreme object of affection and of reverence. In him they saw centralized providential activity of God himself. In this outburst of ecstatic emotion conditioned by prior experiences lay enfolded all subsequent theological reflections and ethical demands. It was only needful that recurring occasions in history should demand new opportunities to clarify thinking and vindicate conduct. This new loyalty had in it more than they anticipated. Indeed it had in it that which would overthrow cherished beliefs and discard social practises. They gradually felt themselves to be cut off from their old religious associations; they found a new and satisfying joy in social intercourse with those whom they once despised; they discovered themselves persecuted by the political power that once protected; in every situation they

[13] Romans 12: 1ff.; 1 Corinthians 12: 1ff.

[14] Acts 2: 23.

found a power that enabled them to pass from the old to the new as by a miracle of God's grace. The historian among the Fellowship found in the extension of the faith from Jerusalem to the uttermost part of the earth the result of power, and this power is the Pentecostal gift.[15] The most remarkable fact in the early church was the ability to reinterpret the Old Testament in the light of the fact of Jesus; the gradual education of Peter so that he could abandon his racial and social and religious prejudices and accept a Gentile into the Fellowship; the illumination of Paul so that he, the high-minded Pharisee, the hungerer and thirster after righteousness, acquired the power to achieve moral effects and experience spiritual values hitherto impossible; the penetrating apologetic that interpreted cosmic and social history under the conception that Jesus was God-at-work-in-the-universe. So sure were they that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, that they believed every event in Jesus' experience was divinely caused. His birth was due to the Spirit of God; qualifications for messianic activity were given by the Spirit; severe testings were appointed by the Spirit; under guidance of the Spirit he entered upon his public ministry in Galilee; by the power of the Spirit he was enabled to work miracles; through the Holy Spirit he offered himself a sacrifice on the cross;[16] by the Spirit of God he was raised from the dead;[17] and through the Spirit he gave his last commandment to his disciples. Peter states his conviction in the words: "God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed by the devil; because God was with him." In the experience of the early church Jesus was so certainly the evidence of the power of God at work, that occasional phraseology makes it impossible for the reader to know with certainty whether the writer

[15] Acts 1: 8.
[16] Hebrews 9: 14.
[17] Romans 8: 9, 10.

means to distinguish between the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, and Christ.[18] One thing is clear, the unseen Jesus has directing power in the historical expansion of the church. The individual and the community enthroned Jesus in the wholeness of his experience as their Lord. It is the enthronement of *Jesus* that provides the solution of all antisocial problems, and makes self-abasement with view to another's enrichment the noblest self-expression. The paradox of individual autonomy and social autonomy is resolved in the social custom following Pentecost, viz., "The breaking of bread." The unity of the many in the One Divine Sustenance is here signified.[19] But it is the One who is remembered in all that he was and did at the Last Supper, and what that Last Supper came to mean as they reflected on him and his worth for them. They grew from faith to faith. From their apprehension of him arose all the moral values that grew out of obedience. Accordingly, the Pauline phrase to describe the human condition of salvation is faith in Christ, not faith only. *It is not faith, but the object of faith that saves,* and faith was in Christ the realization of God's purpose in history. The one who came into new relation with God through justification is the one "who believes in Jesus."[20] The absoluteness of the Christian loyalty is expressed by the phrase "Christ in us," and "we in Christ." He is that which conditions life and the sphere in which life is lived, as we live our physical life in the air and by means of the air.

This language of identity of the believer's experience with that of Jesus is an explanation of the fact that the individual Christian's autonomy is not self-assertive, but Christ-assertive. He is not under law, but in law. His freedom is the spontaneous doing of good, as Jesus did it, esteeming another rather than himself. The group's autonomy is the natural

[18] Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia,* p. 44.
[19] Romans 3: 26.
[20] Romans 3: 26.

functioning of the body, each organ performing its own function, for the good of the whole, since Christ is the life of the whole and hence of all its parts. The group is the temple of the Holy Spirit, that is, the Spirit of Christ who is ethically transcendent. He is the moral imperative for the race. The power of Pentecost is the power granted to the early church, not simply to adapt itself to an ever-changing environment, geographical, social, intellectual, in order to live, but much more increasingly to achieve in its members the moral qualities of Jesus, the Giver of the Spirit, that it may have the power of self-recuperation, when weakened by conformity to environment, and the power of a new creative life when he is enthroned again as the sole dynamic for moral and religious progress.

In the providence of God, by the power of Pentecost, the church has to a large degree passed from infancy to maturity; its progress is illustrated and its present aspiration described in the familiar lines:

> I ask no dream, no prophet's ecstasies;
> No sudden rending of the veil of clay;
> No angel visitant, no opening skies;
> But take the dimness of my soul away.

ZIONISM

I. G. MATTHEWS

Zionism, owing to the tragic events of August last, has so thrust itself into the foreground of the religious thinking of all that it cannot be ignored. It is a star of promise on the near horizon to some, but is a cause of great perplexity to many others. Its genesis is easily traced and is not difficult to evaluate. Anti-Semitism is very old in both name and fact. The Greeks had the virus, and then the Romans became infected. Later it broke out in Spain, and then it swept all the countries of Europe. For seasons there would be a subsidence of its acute form, an incubation period, only to reappear in some quarter with renewed malignancy. The last attack was the predisposing cause of the present Zionist movement.

Anti-Semitism, fostered by Bismarck, due in large part to his aristocratic antagonism to Marxianism, broke out in Germany in 1878. It was a mild type, but it passed to Russia. Here, there was no restraint. At Easter in 1881 the pogroms broke out, and in not a few cities Jewish property was destroyed, men were butchered while women and children suffered greater hardships. Inside of a year, at the call of Lilienblum and Pinsker, a group organized to establish a colony in Palestine, and the same year some forty of them landed at Jaffa. So tragic was the situation in Russia that inside of fifteen years a million Jews had fled from her terrors. Most of these refugees, attracted by the greater economic opportunities and the happier political situations, went to England, and to the Americas, North and South. Only a few thousands found their way to Palestine. These the "Lovers of Zion" who sought a homeland on the banks of the Jordan, were thinking in terms of the Spirit and not of the flesh. Thus the Zionism born of despair was also definitely guided by a lofty idealism. This group had a purpose, inspired by the ancient Prophets

and nourished by the Halakah. They, the dreamers of the Kingdom, were the hardy pioneers of the new-old venture.

At the end of the century, to the disgrace of French militarism and politics, the Anti-Semitic movement focused itself in the notorious Dreyfus case (1894-1897). This aroused Theodore Hertzl who became the tireless advocate of the "Jewish State." Max Nordau and others ably seconded his ideals. Poets sang and orators stirred their compatriots by their narratives of wrongs, their appeals to heroic action, and their visions of the ideal future. In 1897 the "Basel Program" announced Zionism as a political movement whose first object was political autonomy in its old homeland, Palestine. The savagery of persecution had produced a militant ideal.

Like breeds like, and the antagonisms in Russia became still more fierce. The horrible brutalities of the three days' pogroms in Kishinev in 1903 added to the distress and the urgency of Zionism. It helped cement many forces. It enlisted the sympathies of Jews the world over for the suffering, and the rulers of the nations were not backward in offering assistance. Turkey assured the stricken Jew of a homeland, but outside of Palestine. They refused. England offered Uganda in Africa as a home site for the Jewish state, with complete autonomous government, but a determined opposition by a small but important minority threatened to wreck the whole scheme if such a proposition were entertained. Turkey was again approached, and the good offices of the Roman Pontiff were sought. But here the most uncompromising opposition to Jewish settlement in Palestine was met. Other schemes likewise for one reason or for another failed of fruition.

But within Jewry herself there were various currents. There were those who would consider no spot outside of Palestine as a possible homeland. Many like Hertzl saw no hope of anything short of an independent state, a nation, a democracy. Men of a different mold like Ahad Haam, protested vigorously against the idea of a political state. To him material comfort

did not bulk so large as moral idealism and national independence was insignificant alongside of spiritual regeneration. Evolution by means of education was more important to him than revolution and race independence.

Thus compelled by the hard facts of experience, the Turkish government without and the diverse ideals within, by 1911 Zionism had accepted tentatively at least a scheme of small colonies founded in Palestine under Turkish rule. By 1914 twenty-nine such colonies had been opened up in the Holy Land.

Then the great war came and passed, and the rights of minorities became a burning question in the council of the nations. The mandate of Syria was refused by the United States of America, and in April 1920 the San Remo conference assigned Palestine to Great Britain on the conditions laid down in the "Balfour Declaration." This was hailed as the day-dawn by Zionists the world over. It seemed that the end had been reached and that nothing remained but to go up and possess the land. They had forgotten the forty years Moses spent in the Wilderness before he even saw the Promised Land. The two centuries or more their ancestors had spent in Canaan before they scaled the walls of old Zion had taught no wisdom for the present. Eager enthusiasm and urgent need rarely have time to scan the page of history or even to read political documents. Thinking only of themselves they had failed to read the "Balfour Declaration" to the end. Their eager, expectant eyes stopped half way through the important sentence, as is so often done. Here is the sentence:

> His Majesty's government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object.

Why should a Jew, any more than the preacher who has found the phrase he wants on which to hang a sermon, read further? It might damage the sermon, and it might caution patience to

the intrepid Jew. But though most frequently quoted, the above is far from complete. The sentence continues,

> it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

British statesmen, with their long training in democracy and wide experience with complicated problems of race relationships, can ill afford to let prejudices or momentary enthusiasms blind them to questions of ultimate justice. The second part of the sentence is as essential as the first and is worthy of equal emphasis. It seems unfortunate that many of the advocates of Zionism have failed to weigh the import of the whole sentence and have seemed quite uninterested in the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine.

However, since 1920 Zionism in the Holy Land has grown apace. It has passed through a boom period and at least one depression, has been jubilant over its inheritance, and has at least thrice—1920, 1921, and 1929—suffered violence because of its increasing activity.

Two volumes [1] listed below are of the greatest value for the reader who wishes to know the present status of the movement. Both writers are sympathetic to Zionism, but there their similarities end. Waldstein is a Jew, a Zionist. He knows his people, their history, their language. For thirteen years he lived in Palestine and assures us that he does not look through the goggles of a Cook's tourist. His purpose is to illuminate the problem. His biography would accredit him as competent, his book is the evidence of his careful observation, his sanity of judgment, and his first-hand acquaintance with the situation as it is. Doctor Holmes is a Gentile sympathizer with Zionism. He is an American of course, the vigorous leader of the Unity

[1] *Palestine Today and Tomorrow: A Gentile's Survey of Zionism*, by John Haynes Holmes. The Macmillan Company. 1929. *Modern Palestine: Jewish Life and Problems*, by A. S. Waldstein. Bloch Publishing Company, New York. 1927.

center movement in New York City, a versatile writer and an eloquent lecturer. He spent less than three weeks in Palestine, financed by Nathan Straus, the honored guest of the Zionists of Palestine, guided by them to ten of their one hundred and sixty colonies. His book shows that he made a real effort to understand the situation, and in his report he has been quite frank. But the background of the writer does not promise very much wisdom on so serious a problem. We rather resent the European who spends three weeks in America and then publishes a volume of essays on American characteristics. Is the American essayist more judicious? He had an interview with British officials in Palestine and rather naïvely tells us that he "had never before encountered the representatives of empire, these modern successors to the proconsuls of Rome." Yet he has taken their measure, and there is nothing more to be said. He has had private interviews and conferences with the Arab leaders in Jerusalem, and he has hastily visited ten colonies. Well, one wonders if such slight acquaintance with such vastly divergent groups, each one with its long history, is a very sure foundation for such sweeping statements as are found in the book.

However some of the salient points of both books must be presented. Doctor Holmes is an inimitable RACONTEUR. His eyes were always open, and his pen is facile in description. The chapter on "journeyings" is more than interesting, it is a "talkie-movie" of the country visited. With him we slush through the water and mud at Ain-Harod, jump ditches on scary steeds in Esdrælon, plough through swollen wadies on the plain, careen over pasture and furrow in a wild ride across the desert, sit for hours in dripping clothes in the guest-room, and then shiver with him into bed in Safed. We can say amen to every word he utters against the "pious frauds" that are perpetrated by Church and Society alike in regard to "Sacred Places."

Following a brief statement on Zionism, Doctor Holmes

writes at length on the problems in the situation. These are in no way minimized. They are threefold. Zionism, to achieve its destiny, must be rooted in the soil and build on the broad base of agriculture. Here is the first difficulty. The country is already occupied by an Arab population whose possession dates back thirteen hundred years. The area is very small, less than three-fourths the size of New Jersey. Further, the soil is barren, more than half rock, most of it intractable ravine or inhospitable sand ridges. In very truth Zionism faces a stone wall. New Jersey with one-third larger area, with all her soil tillable, all of it more productive than that of Palestine, with great markets at her door, the home of important cities, suburbs and summer resorts attracting and supporting considerable population, with unexcelled transportation and access to the sea, a State at peace at home and abroad has a population of a little over two and a half millions. Palestine, by official count has less than 800,000. When we think of the barren soil, a considerable part of it unworkable by anything but a hoe, its scanty water supply, its lack of raw material, save the salts of the Dead Sea and the unlimited limestone, its distance from markets, we quite fail to follow the author and many Zionists when they dream that there may still be added to the population some 2,000,000 Jews. The British commission that, after two years of careful, comprehensive work, reported in the autumn of 1927, that with stable government and fully developed agriculture and industries, the country might support a population of 1,250,000, seems to have been dealing with facts not fancies.

A backward glance into the Zionist population is informing. Doctor Holmes using the official statistics for March, 1929, shows that then there were 149,555 Jews and 557,649 Moslems in the country. Statistics are indeed illuminating. It is worth noting, for example, that in 1924 there were reported officially 154,000 Jews and 540,000 Moslems. In five years with Zionism in the heat of its propaganda, the Jewish population has de-

creased while the Moslem has increased. In fact, month after month official statistics show more Jews leaving the country than entering. We wonder if the author had his ear close enough to the ground to hear the murmur of those who only a few years ago arrived as ardent Zionists, but who now would rejoice if by any means they could raise the passage money to land on some more hospitable shore.

Among Palestinian Jewry there are many currents flowing and, methinks, a three-weeks' visit scarcely fits one to be a final interpreter. With fine enthusiasm Doctor Holmes has parodied an old proverb to the effect, " Scratch Palestine anywhere, and you will find Israel." A more correct revision would be " Scratch Palestine most anywhere, and you will find the Bedouin." Up to the present time it has been a " land flowing with milk and honey," the sheep have been on the hillside and the bees have lived in the rocky clefts. The God of things as they are has determined that under natural conditions the large proportion of the population must live by the sheep and the goats. The Seleucids, the Ptolemies, and then later, Rome made it a garrison center for their military programs. Modern industrialism or the American tourist and archæologist may here and there develop small institutions and small centers, but Palestine herself, producing within limited areas the grape, the olive, the fig, lentils, almonds, and oranges, with a little barley and wheat, is likely for a long period to be the home of the Bedouin. Such a life is not likely to become very attractive to the Zionist. It is hard to kick against the pricks.

But the second problem is scarcely less serious. Palestine is now occupied by the Arabs, whose ancient inheritance is indisputable. These people, mostly Bedouin, have neither wish to leave nor place to go. It is their ancient homeland. They have adapted themselves to the rigorous demands of soil and climate. Their ancestors are buried here. Their customs and their very religion are bound up in it. The second half of Balfour's famous sentence guarantees them their civil and relig-

ious rights. This is not a stone wall, nor is it a condition that has always been considered impregnable, but it is one that neither modern civilization nor the British sense of justice can lightly disregard. The author has fully sensed the situation and has sympathetically described it.

But a third problem of still greater gravity exists. That is, who is going to rule the country? English, Jew, or Arab? Ah! there's the rub. Doctor Holmes is an idealist, and would seem ready to take the consequences of his idealism. He considers the English mandate the greatest blow to true Zionism (p. 119). The coming of the English obtruded the consciousness of power, and the reliance of the Jew was now on Empire (p. 255). So long as Zionism shelters herself behind the sword, this alienation between Arab and Jew will continue (p. 256).

But had there been no British mandate, had there been Arab autonomy, with three centers, Jerusalem, Beirut, and Damascus, as was first desired, where would aggressive Zionism have been? Those who have lived with the Arab have only one answer. History has some rather lurid side-lights on racial and religious animosities. The Bishop of Jerusalem may have been near the truth when he said, had it not been for the troops the Jews would have been wiped out to a man (p. 120).

Doctor Holmes remains an idealist when he interprets the spirit of Zionism itself. To chronicle the heroism of the various groups, highly to value the venture of faith and the adventure in the new and freer types of life, to appraise the spirit of toleration, and above all fully to recognize the unquenchable zeal for the things of the spirit on the part of many Zionists, is a laudable task and has been well and nobly done. But alongside of a Jeremiah with a spiritual concept of the Kingdom we usually find some Prince in Israel who is ready to play the game of politics and rely on the sword. A strong element in Zionism is national rather than religious. The idea of a " Jewish State " came in early and has always been clamorous for its rights. It is no wonder that as the result of so much persecution it has

seized the dagger in reply. Bialik, the great poet of Zionism, has stirred every quarter with his " Tale of Slaughter." Here he rebukes the craven spirit of passivism and calls down the wrath of heaven on the oppressor. One very deep and swiftly running current in modern Zionism is militant.

Nothing could indicate this more convincingly than the numerous attacks made this week, November 20, by Jewish organizations and publications, vigorously assailing the utterances of Dr. Judah Magnes, chancellor of the Jewish university in Jerusalem. Doctor Magnes, one of the foremost leaders of Judaism, conversant with Palestinian and world situations, is a mild exponent of the cultural movement of which Ahad Haam was the leading exponent. Doctor Magnes is opposed to the retention of Jewish rights by bayonet, in a land where the majority of the inhabitants have rights that run counter to these. He hopes for a type of government, that safeguarding the rights of all will enable two peoples of different tradition to live and work together in mutual respect. He is further reported to have suggested that Zionism should renounce all ideas of political dominance and seek to develop her spiritual genius. The result has been that a responsible Jewish organization such as the Vaad Leumi of which Pincas Rutenberg is president, has condemned his propaganda, his resignation as chancellor of the university has been called for by the Jewish press in Palestine, American Jews of influence have called his attitude a " counsel of defeat and surrender " and the American veterans of the Jewish legion consider his statements " treason to the most sacred Jewish ideals during the entire exile." This furore shows how deeply rooted the " Jewish State "—in Palestine ideals—is in the Jewish consciousness. Hence the question, Who will rule Palestine—Arab, Jew, or British? is most serious. Will Britain relinquish or be permitted to relinquish her mandate? If so, then what?

When Doctor Holmes comes to the achievements or the promise he does not deal so adequately with the situation as

with the problems. Yet these are vividly portrayed. The hopeful struggle with the soil, the conflict with malaria and tropical diseases, the roads often impassable in winter, the cold and the damp, the slow triumph of the orange groves, the eucalyptus trees, improved breeds of sheep and hens, a lime kiln at Haifa, the splendid streets and electric light at Tel-Aviv, all are thrown on an enlarged canvas. All that is said is true, but the spell of the orator is on the page. We might easily dream that the land might become one large orange-olive-grape-garden, with thriving cities on every hillside, with splendid homes, running water, bathtub, and electric light within the reach of all. But achievements will be only in proportion to the tremendous self-sacrifice of the populace, and some corners of the desert will never blossom as the rose.

The detailed achievements are presented without any illusion by Waldstein. His narrative is never so picturesque, but it is more practical and more accurate than that of the former. His story of the origin and the genius of the settlements is much more informing than Holmes's. His clear-cut statement of the beginning and the controlling spirit of the old settlement, that its interest is in the petty detail of the law, is needed to balance the rhetorical glamor of that of the New York pastor. His recognition that the tendency of the Jew is cityward, hence the need for the creation of village communities for the farmer, is wise. The fact that Hebrew is not used in many schools and that many, not only of the immigrants, but of the old settlement as well, are quite ignorant of Hebrew (Waldstein, p. 102-103) is a needed corrective to the flamboyant statement of the tourist that "today in all Jewish Palestine no other language is used but the ancient language of the prophets" (Holmes, p. 228-229). Exuberance building on inadequate observation has often carried the Gentile into a veritable fairy-land.

The Jewish social, educational, and religious life is carefully analyzed by Waldstein. The intense interest of most in education, the slow emergence of a cultural life, the puritanical

cast of many, the struggle for the Hebrew language, the various efforts toward local self-government, the relation with the Arab, and many similar problems are all detailed with the sympathy of a man who is a Zionist and with the accuracy of a scholar who lived in the country for thirteen years.

For any one who would understand the spirit of Zionism, Holmes is graphic, even fascinating, but Waldstein is essential. Let him read Holmes, caper along with him in the early morning, catch a glimpse of the landscape from the pinnacles, visit the bare barracks of some of the communities, put on rosy spectacles, and beneath the drab exterior find the heroic courage of the pioneer and the saint. With him let him ride up hill and down dale in a hurried scamper to meet well-arranged appointments, sit with him in conferences and listen to his interpretation of the spirit of Zionism. But let him not fail to read Waldstein. He will add to the quota of facts, give a truer perspective, and enable the reader to arrive at far juster conclusions.

The reviewer with a little knowledge of Jewish history and the opportunity to meet Zionist and Arab afforded by a winter's residence in Jerusalem, is convinced that political Zionism is but gathering its energies for disaster. Clamorous for a homeland, the claims to which are largely legendary and are long outlawed; so insistent on its own so-called rights and so forgetful of the rights of others; bonused and inspired by "absentee lords," the "Jewish State" seems guided not by the spirit of the great prophets so much as by that of Judas Maccabeus and Bar-Cochba. History has often confirmed the judgment that those who live by the sword shall perish by the sword.

But the cultural movement is different in inception and ideal. The Zionism of Ahad Haam, Judah Magnes, and others who believe that the Jew may again make a spiritual contribution to humanity, is worthy of perpetuity and a place of leadership. From Judaism have come some of the most valued ideals in human history. These were never fostered by any

Jewish state, they often came to birth in spite of it. Even so may it be again. It is ever true that

> The tumult and the shouting dies;
> The captains and the kings depart;
> Still stands thine ancient sacrifice,
> An humble and a contrite heart.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

We congratulate our readers on the privilege of reading the article on "A Realistic View of Theism" by Professor William Kelley Wright, of the Department of Philosophy in Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire. He is author of "A Student's Philosophy of Religion" and of "General Introduction to Ethics." We are especially gratified to be able to offer this significant paper of Professor Wright, as presenting the mature judgment of a philosopher and college professor of outstanding ability and culture.

From another angle, and significant because the work of a pastor of wide reading and practical contacts with men and students, is the article by Mr. Norton. He sounds the alarm of many thoughtful men who view the situation of a militant, practically atheistic, Humanism as over against a ministry which is uninformed and busy contending among themselves with issues of a past century.

Powell H. Norton is a Crozer Alumnus, Class 1914, a B. D. and Th. M. He also was a student of Temple University, the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania, a fellow in Dropsie College in Hebrew and Cognate learning, and Barnard C. Taylor Fellow, Crozer Seminary. Serving as Chaplain in United States Navy during the World War, and having pastorates in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, at present minister at Hightstown Baptist Church, N. J., since 1924, he writes with contagious enthusiasm and learning. One must read "The Modern Distemper."

Can any good thing come out of a study of statistics and percentages of gains and losses, real or apparent? Professor Conrad Henry Moehlman, of the Department of History of Christianity in Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, answers

affirmatively in his article "Is the Sunday School Doomed." One expects considerable discussion of his conclusions, and some heart-searching reflections, as well as reexamination of some of the present-day methods and aims of our religious education efforts.

As a form of response to Professor Moehlman's question concerning the Sunday school, the article by Director Ivan G. Grimshaw on "The Flint School of Religion" is relevant and suggestive, as well as informing. Doctor Grimshaw is an A. B. in Biblical Literature, Hiram College, 1924; B. D. in Pastoral Service, Yale Divinity School, 1926; M. A. in Religious Education, Chicago, 1927; Research Fellow in Practical Theology completing residence requirements for Ph. D. in Religious Education, 1927-28. Pastor of Christian Church, Ghent, Ohio, fall of 1923; Chaplain of Woodcraft School, Culver Military Academy, Culver, Indiana, summer of 1924; Director of Recreation, Ford Republic, Farmington, Michigan, summer of 1926.

President Milton G. Evans needs no introduction to our readers, but we remind them that his article bears on the proposed nineteen-hundredth anniversary of Pentecost, about which a great deal may be written, "pro and con." Here will be found considerations worth taking note of when the proposition takes more definite form.

Zionism, whether in the spiritual or the political aspect of it, or both aspects, carries in it the hopes and fears of all the years since the proposed return of the Jews to the Holy Land was first made long ago. Prof. I. G. Matthews of the Crozer Faculty offers some timely, particularly timely, contribution in the course of his evaluation of two books dealing with this dream of the years. As a long-time student of the land and as a sober-minded resident there, his criticisms or commendations are worthy of study.

NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS

SPENSER B. MEESER

In the Gospel of John is the story of a man who has had an experience with Jesus, and through it was led to faith in him as "the Son of God."

He was born blind. One day a stranger passed his way and, anointing his eyes with clay, bade him go wash the clay off in the pool of Siloam. With a suggestion of irony seals the eyes that are blind, covers them with clay, and sends the man, who cannot see where he is going, to a distant pool.

What reason the blind man had to expect that this obedience would avail for his blindness, we are not told. Nevertheless he goes, washes, and returns, seeing. His neighbors also see the reality of his restoration to sight. Awed and rejoiced by his new experience, the man himself did not at once think through the meaning of his recovery, nor attribute to his healer any qualities. When they asked him how it happened, he answers simply, "A man that is called Jesus anointed my eyes with clay, and bade me wash the clay off in the pool of Siloam." So far, he is concerned only with the fact of new vision, and is rejoicing in it.

Very early, criticism, in the person of the Pharisees, says: "What kind of a man is this? We say that he is not of God, for he does not regard the Sabbath. What do you say of him?"

The question sets the man to reflecting. His moral judgment works quickly and with directness; and immediately faith is conceived in his heart. In the cure of his blindness he sees the evidence of benevolent purpose and a power never known to have been exercised by a wicked man, and which can be attributed only to God, and he answers, "He is a prophet."

Some time later, criticism, baffled in its effort to discredit

the man's testimony to Jesus, by the witness of his parents that he was indeed born blind, returns to the attack with accusation, and says, "We know this man is a sinner." That is, criticism raises a theological question, starts an ethical inquiry determined to discredit the man and his witness by some dialectic that will embarrass or confuse him.

The man's faith is but newly formed, and his theology is immature. He knows he is no match for these disputers, and so he replies: "Whether he be a sinner or not, I know not. I am no theologian. I simply stand by the fact that being once blind I now see." The fact remains, whatever may be the theology of it.

He should have known, however. Facts enough of moral significance were at hand, and it was not long before reason found a way to a clear conviction. Nevertheless, he makes the best possible defense at this stage of his conflict with criticism. Over against theological doubt in the minds of others he puts the facts of experience in his own life, and rests in those facts.

Once again criticism returns to the attack. Failing to gainsay the fact of his cure, or reason it out of existence, or give the deed of Jesus an immoral bearing, or secure an ill judgment of the beneficiary against the Benefactor, it becomes agnosticism and says: "We know that God spake to Moses; but this fellow! we know not whence he is. We are agnostics." Thus criticism always finally becomes agnostic, because it is intellectually immoral, violates the laws of intelligence and of evidence.

In the presence of critical theology, faith timidly retreats to the basal facts in experience and does not attempt to justify Jesus in an apparent violation of the Sabbath. Faith is not trained in casuistry, and this man as yet lacked correct moral insight; for he had been too long misled by his teachers. But now, in the presence of agnosticism, aroused and impelled to correct thought by the wilful unbelief of the agnostics, faith

in the man leaps up into conviction, and constructs its simple, direct theology.

The man reasons: "Marvelous! that ye know not whence he is who hath opened my eyes. We all know that God does not hear sinners, but those only who are righteously in sympathy with him. I know that this man has opened the eyes of one born blind, and we all know that such a thing has never before occurred in the history of the world. Simple evidence shows that a work of God has been done by this Man. I'll tell you whence he is. He is of God."

Come straightly thus far, the man is now ready for another step in experience on the way to mature faith. He has been, in his thinking, true to the facts of his experience, and has reasoned honestly to the moral conclusion. He has been loyal to that moral conclusion in the face of learned critics. Fronted with the question of the moral status of Jesus, he has, up to the limit of his knowledge, confessed Jesus as a Healer, and is enough ethically consistent to confess his faith that Jesus is of God. For these declarations he has been excommunicated.

At this point, Jesus, having heard that they had cast him out, and finding him, came to him to let him see with new opened eyes this Man from God, and to give him a deeper vision, an insight. Experience had led him to the threshold; now Jesus will open the door.

"Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" Jesus asks. "Who is he, Lord, that I may believe on him?" the man replies. And Jesus answers: "Thou hast both seen him"—loyalty to truth had given the man a prevision—"and it is he that talketh with thee." Looking into the face of the man called Jesus, from whom he had received healing, for whose coming from God he had been reasoning, on whose account he had been outcast, faith now sees through, recognizes the glory of God in the face of Jesus, and he cries, "Lord, I believe." And he worshiped him.

It is a magnificent climax, from the artistic as well as spiritual point of view. Conceive the situation: A man born blind having now his first experiences of sight; conscious that a great marvel had been done in him; moving about dazed, aye, dazzled with the glories that greet his vision; looking for the first time on the beauties of land and city and temple; possibly having but the once seen the faces of his parents; deserted now by them for fear of the Jews; daring, with moral insight to defend his Benefactor against the trained teachers of his nation; repudiated by his coreligionists, and at this moment looking into the eyes of Jesus and hearing his voice, "Dost thou believe?"

This incident gives us the natural history of faith. There comes to the soul some command of righteousness. Obedience finds the word of Jesus Christ full of a divine beneficence. Then follow the testimony to experience; the beginnings of faith; the growth of faith; the betrayal of faith into poor theology; the reversion to experience; the improved theology; the revived and renewed faith; the larger, more intimate experience; the satisfying vision, and at last the whole acceptance and worship of Jesus as "the Son of God." Faith begins in experience with "a Man called Jesus," and finds in him a prophet, who must be a man from God, seen at last to be "the Son of God."

The incident also points out that it is through experience, in obedience of Jesus, that men reach a full and abiding faith. The moral and spiritual redemption experienced becomes the attest of Jesus' unique personality; and the experience in reaching certitude in this manner suggests this as the type for all human quest for reality in the spiritual realm: experience in the obedience of faith. Faith builds her castle on this impregnable rock. That experience of redemption in man's own heart and life becomes the efficient defense in all assaults of doubt, whatever its form; criticism, accusation, agnosticism,

or suspicion. It becomes the one infallible in their religious life. They should not let the memory or the evidence of it be dimmed.

Poor theologians they may be, unable to answer the pedantic sophistries of theological egoists; but the facts of experience in moral redemption they cannot gainsay. Improved theologians they may become when criticism turns agnostic. They know one thing: They were once blind, now they see. Moral sight and life and hope are now theirs, who once were blind, hopeless, and morally dead. They know two things: They know that God does not build a moral life on a deception and a lie. Their moral reasoning may be naïve, but they have no use for a religion, however urgent it may be, if it is not true. They know three things: This Jesus has ministered to all that is highest, holiest, and most profound in their lives, and that in him God has gotten hold on their soul's center. They know four things: They know Jesus is of God.

Their moral sense can be trusted to build a simple—true, even if simple—theology of these facts; and when criticism has cast them out of the temple of wisdom, and cut them off from the synagogue of the learned, Jesus comes to them in fresh experience. Jesus finds them, confirms faith with a clearer revelation to their exiled souls, and gives them the joy of looking into his face, and of knowing him as indeed the Son of God.

Faith based on experience is the faith that endures. It may be shaken by arguments and philosophies, it may be deflected awhile by cries and jeers; but it abides and reasserts itself because there stands the fundamental, uncontradicted, incontrovertible experience. This experience carries the soul through all those hesitancies which the critical attitude of intellectual Pharisaism brings to men, through its literary agnosticisms, into confirmed faith. Like this man they fall back onto the reality and certainty of their redemptive experience with

Christ Jesus, and from that they are able to climb up onto some things that they know. The course of true faith rarely runs smooth, does not always move steadily upward, is likely to have some setbacks, is sometimes betrayed for awhile into poor theology, but the fundamental experience rights men at last, and enables them to fix on some certainties, from which faith looks up into heaven again.

And here is the doctrine of the doctrines; for here, in the continuous experience with Christ, is the source of wisdom in divine things, the corrective and strengthener of faith. Jesus distinctly teaches the worth of experience as a validating principle with regard to all his doctrine. He said: "If any man willeth to do his [God's] will [as Jesus teaches it] he shall know of the doctrine, whether it is of God, or I (Jesus) speak from myself." He does not say that willingness to do God's will will reveal the doctrine or truth, as so many erroneously conclude, but that the teaching of Jesus, put into the experience of obedience, will find in that experience the validation that the teaching is of God.

Our intellectual difficulties with religious doctrine are mainly created by our unethical intellectualism. That is to say, they arise in the attempts to test and attest moral and spiritual realities with intellectual formulas, instead of trying them through vital experience in life and conduct.

Such a test is, to begin with, non-moral. Moral reality can have no moral test until it be incarnate, acted out. When doctrines of moral reality are only intellectually tried or philosophically examined, and are not applied in life and conduct, they do not have the supreme and essential moral test. For the moral and spiritual have no reality, save in personal beings and in their mutual relations; that is, in God and man. Spiritual realities, right and righteousness, truth and love, are not "things in themselves"; they are qualities of personal beings. As Jesus says, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." He

means that Truth is true being, being in absolute right relation with God.

Correct thought of these realities can be achieved only in the total experience of personal beings. They are not matters of correct and logical reasoning primarily, but of life itself in its totality. They are not merely logical, but biological; or, more correctly still, they are personal. And it can be known whether such realities be, and what they are only by the activity of our whole personal being—emotion, thought, and will. As Browning (*Ferishtah's Fancies*) says:

> Consider well!
> Were knowledge all thy faculty, then God
> Must be ignored; love gains Him by first leap.

Indeed, reflection and reasoning concerning the eternal realities must follow the sensing and the experience of them. The bared intellect (the speculative reason) cannot properly function as the discoverer of their existence or as the means of disproving their reality. The moral reality which we sense, and the spiritual reality that appears implicit in all our life, as well as that declared by Another—these we can know are only through the exercise of our total personal being. We find the rationale of what is explicit or implicit in our life by intellectual process, or we fail to think through the problems involved, as the case may be. But we make no moral, because no real determination in the case, unless we try the life in them and on them. Certainly nothing worthy of confidence is arrived at by the endeavor solely to rationalize about such personal reality; or by the imagination that reasoning about it is all there is to the matter; or that such reasoning is final. We come upon affirmations of such reality. We try our thought on them, but we do not try them to see if they will work in life; we try them to see if they will fit into our systems of philosophy, or our schemes of knowledge. Jesus turns our thought to the test of experience, which involves the whole personality, and says:

"Do the will, do the teaching; then you shall know whether it is of God, whether it is the truth."

The attest of any moral and spiritual teaching is in its effect in life, whether it will work in character and conduct; not whether it will fit into the norm of some other sphere, the abnormal of mere intellectualism, the system of a philosopher, or the hypothesis of science. Life was not made for philosophy or theology. Religion arises in life from God in the soul of man. The theory of it which will not work in life, or fit the facts of religion as it is in man, is not part of the universal truth. Religion first, then theology; and theology must fit religion. The test of all moral truth is the life it comes from as seen through the life it produces.

On the other hand, the bare intellectual or philosophical test is not only unmoral, it is not always relevant, and therefore unscientific. For science (accurate knowledge) demands that we try a theory by experience, and approve an hypothesis by experiment, and by experiment in the realm to which the theory is relevant. A theory in psychology is put to the test of psychological experiment; a theory of the physical world is tried in physical experiment; sociology seeks confirmation in the facts of social life. We do not test a physical theory with sociological phenomena, nor our psychology with a test-tube reaction in a chemical laboratory. And moral doctrine must have a moral test, and a spiritual insight a spiritual test. But moral and spiritual tests can be applied only in life, in conduct, and character.

I have often said to my liberal fellows and friends: "If we wish acceptance of our liberal ideas, we must show them to be of moral and spiritual worth and dynamic. Our professed leadership lays on us, as prophets, the almost insupportable burden of incarnating our ideas in character, and of making clear that they are the soul of human goodness. If we cannot show them related as cause and effect to high character and

superb virtue, they will remain as idle speculations. It won't do merely to make them fit into the ruling philosophy, or argue that they are in harmony with the last shift in scientific hypothesis. That is academic and irrelevant to life; and religion belongs to life. If our ideas will not work in the moral and spiritual life of man, they not only are of no earthly or heavenly good, but they are not true."

LIFE is the sphere for the test of religious truth. If men spent more time doing the teachings of Christ, experiencing the glorious results of obedience to his word, and less time in criticizing and analyzing its claims by intellectual processes alone, they would sooner reach conviction on a scientific basis. The theology that won't work when men try it isn't true. The religion that only a few can understand isn't of God; unless God can be conceived as intending religion for a clique of intellectuals only. Christianity awaits the perfect scientific test. It has scarcely yet had a fair one. It will have received that test only when men perfectly obey its teacher, doing his teaching. If then we are not able to give it acceptance as of God, and therefore as absolute moral and spiritual truth, then, and only then Jesus has proved himself a false or a deceived teacher; a time character, not the eternal Christ.

BUT science also requires that theory shall be tested by fact. The antagonisms to Christian doctrine arise mainly in the constant application of contrasts, not of fact, but of hypothesis; theories, some of them fairly well attested by facts in the realm of the theory, but in strict sense none of them absolutely proved; all of them resting on assumptions in the theory of knowledge or in the realm of law. I am an evolutionist, and a constant and sympathetic, if humble student of natural science and of philosophy; but am compelled to say that of all the crude misapplications of science—good science too—none equal the unscientific tests applied to morals and religion. One is confi-

dent that every man can see that these two laws are constantly violated, when the facts of religion are under consideration—the law of experiment in the relevant sphere, and the law of fact.

It is not necessary that I should say that I am not at war with science. I trust I am still sane. In truth, I am pleading for a strict, scientific method in the validation of religious theory—theology. Nor is it necessary to remind the reader that it is not the observable facts of science that stand in contradiction to the religion of Christ; strictly speaking, it isn't science at all. It is the assumptions of intellectualism that are set in contrast to the truths of the moral and spiritual world; truths which can have no real test and attest but in the experience of life.

Moral and spiritual realities belong to and arise in the realm of personality; and if we claim that they shall have the tests of personal life applied to them in every consideration given to them, it is not because we deny the rights of science, or philosophy, or psychology; or that we question the worth of the contributions these have made to our knowledge. It is only because we see that, as William Adams Brown says: "When it comes to the deepest secrets of personality, the methods of science break down, and the last word must always be spoken by the human spirit. The spirit has its own way of recognizing spiritual reality, and by it alone the possibilities of the personal life can be determined."

WHAT men all need to do is to make fresh exposure of their whole life—their whole life, notice you—to the person and truth of Jesus Christ. We are to receive the kingdom of God as a little child; which does not mean without intelligence, or mature judgment, but with our whole being in action. We need a fresh exposure of the whole of our life to the spirit and influences of that kingdom. We belong not to the mineral, or the vegetable, or the animal kingdom, but to the kingdom of

persons, which is the kingdom of God. And religion is at home only in that kingdom of persons. Here the whole personal being must be in action.

This is characteristic of the child—that it fronts truth with a whole undivided life. Truth has a chance at the whole being of the child. There is an essential difference in the habit of mind between a child and one of mere intellectual prudence and acumen. The child allows his whole composite being to act; the merely intellectualized person, when he fronts truth, suppresses impulse, ignores instinct, quenches, so far as possible, his emotions, neglects his will—whole kingdoms of his being. God cannot reveal his heart in an intellection, or disclose his will and its worth to a man in a proposition. Heart must feel Love, and the will must will the Will. God is not a Universe Idea, nor the main assumption of a system of philosophy. To the bare intellect God cannot disclose his whole personality of love and holy will. The bared intellect (if, indeed, there ever were such) "puts itself outside truth and speculates on it." We need to move by act of will, with love of the heart inspiring, and with moral sense directing, inside the truth and with truth inside of us.

Some of us cannot escape the surprise that so many men of scholarly attainment and of superb intellectual powers, get such partial views, and fail in power to perceive where their views are defective, and so run away from fact, as well as faith. It certainly is not because they use reasoning method; rather, because they use only the reasoning methods, or try to; use nothing more, and therefore use those defectively.

Many instances of this may arise. Here is one who writes about the absoluteness of Jesus' religious and ethical teachings, recorded in the New Testament; raises the question whether any one speaking so long ago could speak the perfect law for all the ages in the progressing life of man. It is a fresh shift in the scenes of the theological drama. Most men have felt that those teachings were still far enough above our attainment to

satisfy any man of their absolutely final character, however pious he might be. Many have given them up as counsels of perfection, forever beyond man.

We wonder whether we had not better, as a matter of philosophic and ethical wisdom, and as scientific Christians, wait until we try to work those teachings a little deeper into life, and until we come a little closer to them in character and conduct, before we raise that question? For our practical life they still seem lofty enough to be the absolute.

We say this, not because we wish to be facetious, but because the real and supreme test of the worth of all moral teachings lies in this—that we try them, do them, live them, get them into conduct and character, and see how they work; then reason can follow with the will and the heart approve them.

Many there are who, theoretically, admit this principle, who claim that the only claimants to be truth and duty that can have authority in our life, are such as meet the test of experience; but they do not apply experience in the sense of action, or life in its wholeness, but in the sense of a subjective intellectualism, which may be wholly artificial.

To save themselves and us the trouble of making the tests of life in actual experience, they live the drama of life in propositions, and test moral and spiritual reality with their theses. The speculative reason, attempts at bare, pure thought, dialectics, is what they mean by experience. The really moral, personal life is no part of the drama; the actors are automaton ideas, worked by the hidden philosopher. Only thoughts appear. No real experience is inciting the conclusion; only reasoning moves of itself. The effect in character is not rated as having evidential value. The conclusions are of this worth, as a matter of course, they are the necessary issue of reason, of abstract thought, of philosophy; but they are things not moral or redemptive, but logical simply, or illogical, as the case may be. A necessity of the reasoning process certifies to

nothing outside itself; is evidence only that that thought exists; not that its corresponding reality exists in the objective world. Such rationalism has almost as often come to orthodox as to heretical conclusions; but it is no better in the one than in the other case.

Our need is suggested, let me venture to say once more, by the experience of this blind man: The fresh and sincere exposure of our whole being to the world of moral and spiritual reality, the experience of fresh devotion to the person of Jesus Christ, and unhesitating obedience to his teaching. In these we shall find, even as he said, whether his teaching is of God—that is, whether his is the true doctrine.

For the approval or disapproval of the teachings of Jesus, or of such variant interpretations of his teachings as come to us, we find the validating or invalidating principle, the corrective principle as well, in the redemptive moral experience, which arises in the obedience of faith to the word of Jesus Christ. This redemption, and its recurrences in the moral experiences of life give us the norm by which we may know reality in the moral and spiritual realm. For the only competent test of moral and spiritual reality is its operation in a personal life; not in a proposition in philosophy, or a theory in natural science.

BOOK REVIEWS

Mrs. Eddy, the Biography of a Virginal Mind. Edwin Franden Dakin. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1929. Pp. 523. Price, $5.00.

Mr. Dakin has performed an invaluable service for students of religion. He has given in this splendidly documented work a faithful, but withal, a sympathetic portraiture of Mrs. Mary Baker G. Eddy.

The history of Christian Science as a movement sketched within the book, follows very closely, as the author gratefully acknowledges, the story so comprehensively and frankly, if not heroically, told by Miss Georgine Milmine in *McClure's Magazine* of over twenty years ago. The value of the present work is that it gives us the life-story, and an intimate glimpse into the mind of the Founder, as the subtitle indicates. We are introduced into the Baker home with its stern religious outlook, the rather exceptional intellectual ability of some of its members, the mental and physical illness of Mary, the youngest child. But even in childhood there is evidence of marked literary ability, and the power of self-expression and assertion. On through life we trace that conflict, a burning, dynamic force seeking freedom and achievement beyond this weakened and, at times, painfully racked physical frame. And it did triumph—the spirit over the material!

It is a biography that makes us understand this woman who rose from obscurity through poverty and pain to heights of love, honor, and fame. Our sympathy goes out to her and our honor also in the light of that magnificent achievement, though we may not always agree with her methods nor ever, perhaps, with her views. This also is Mr. Dakin's achievement, and he has performed his task well.

However, to understand any religion completely one thing more is necessary. The first question that arises in such a study is: Why did the founder teach and practise this? That question Mr. Dakin has answered. The second question is: Why was the teaching acceptable? What gave it a following? That deals with the social origins. This has not yet been done for Christian Science. Some day some one will depict for us the social order in America of which Mrs. Eddy was a part—that will help us to understand the sudden rise and marvelous growth of this belief and sect.

R. E. E. Harkness.

Religion and the Modern Mind. CHARLES C. COOPER, Editor. New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1929. Pp. 227. Price, $2.00.

"THE HUNGRY CLUB is an intellectual forum of Pittsburgh," the members of which "through some twenty years, at noon on busy Mondays, . . have endeavored to develop 'a passion for understanding' which postulates an earnest effort to get the view-point of the speaker." Before this group, which soon outgrew its accommodations, were delivered during the season of 1928-29 seven addresses seeking "to discover the essential meaning of religion today from the standpoint of agnosticism, science, psychology, philosophy, the Ethical Culture Movement, Judaism, and Christianity."

It would seem in reading these addresses, which have been printed to form this book, that most of the writers still think of religion as a form of belief—belief primarily in a Supreme Being and then certain beliefs about him. It certainly is true of Doctor Curtis who writes from the standpoint of science, and of Doctor Gabbert from that of philosophy. Doctor Goldenson, as a Jewish rabbi, interprets religion as an effort to find the meaning of life and discovers behind the universe a great Will who determines the moral order. Doctor Elliott, leader of the Ethical Culture Society, thinks of religion as the attempt to achieve "interconnectedness with other lives" and "it is this socialized idea of the divine which the ethical movement is attempting to realize and cherish in the world."

Bishop McConnell from the view-point of Christianity declares that "the best proof of a religion's moral genuineness" is its ability to exercise "control of the material world," and this Christianity seeks to do "for the highest conceivable human purposes."

The most informing and valuable chapter of the book is that of Dr. E. S. Ames, who alone approaches his subject from the true standpoint of a scientist. It is the task of Psychology in this sphere, he tells us, to interpret the religious person—what does he seek and how does he act? That would seem to be the only possible approach, for religion can, of course, never be studied apart from the religious, that is the human, being.

The least satisfying, perhaps, of all the addresses is the one delivered by Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes, who speaks from the standpoint of the Agnostic. Doctor Barnes, as usual, is the angry iconoclast furiously waving the big club. The trouble is, he still thinks of religion as a bundle of primitive, childish fears and beliefs perpetuated by priests and medicine-men. One sometimes wonders if the real need of this professor of

Historical Sociology may not be a course in the history of religions. He ought to learn that he cannot impeach an entire race.

R. E. E. Harkness.

The Quest of the Ages. A. Eustace Haydon. New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1929. Pp. 234. Price, $2.50.

Those interested in the present-day problems of religion in any form have long awaited this book. It is the Philosophy of Religion based, not upon speculation, but upon the History of Religions and from the pen of one who is a recognized scholar in that field.

In his definition of religion the author rightly begins with man. Why has man ever been religious, or what does man seek through religion, what does religion do for man? And, from the study of religions, the answer is that man is seeking the deepest and most abiding satisfactions of life; to master this world in which he finds himself, to be at home in it, to find peace, harmony, triumph of the spirit. Thus all theologies, and cosmologies, heavens and hells, creeds and doctrines, shrines and cathedrals, faiths and confessions represent creations of man to help him on his way . . means toward an end.

With primitive man the good, most greatly to be desired, was necessarily the satisfaction of life's physical needs. But soon man learned that superior to this was love, loyalty, faithfulness, good-will. Likewise in that dim dawn of things, man felt that this world, which at times was so kindly and at others so cruel, sheltered forces now friendly and now hostile. Thus the gods had their origin in an "emotional response" of man to his environment. In this endless, unyielding quest, fundamental in human nature, man needed assistance and so in time the gods became his "helpers in the quest for the values of the good life." But human needs differ with environment and time, and so the gods differ, that is, are pictured and conceived according to the demands of the locality and the age in which man lives. Thus with the development of civilization and the unifying of the world came the great Gods and monotheism. All are functional, meeting the social need.

But still the quest continues. Religion can never die. Man will conquer his universe and win those supremely worth-while values for which the race has ever struggled. His greatest evils, he knows, are those of the social order. He has well-nigh conquered his physical world, he fears it no longer; through medical science he is determined to destroy those many ills to which flesh is heir, and Doctor Haydon believes as firmly that man can and will master the social world, bringing in those bonds

of the Spirit for which mankind has ceaselessly prayed—righteousness, good-will, peace.

The power is within our own hands. First of all to determine what the ideal of the good life is, and then to make it possible. "A tremendous responsibility rests upon the leaders of the organized religions of the world, for only a rebirth in new form can prepare churches and temples for such a task. Will sects and denominations be willing to die that religion may live through them?"

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

The Effective Christian College. LAIRD T. HITES, Ph. D. New York: The Macmillan Company. Pp. 259. $2.00.

THIS is a book which wins the reader's immediate, whole-hearted respect, and which yet leaves him with a sense of futility and failure. Its argument moves steadily forward upon many remarkably strong and convincing points, but it also has its striking weaknesses. It compels one's admiration because of its complete survey of its chosen field, its exhaustive treatment of the subject, and its meeting of almost every conceivable objection to its thesis; and yet it does not wholly convince.

For instance, the author asserts that the Christian college—that is, the college "which receives students and funds and moral support from the churches"—should, therefore, "educate Christian students for religious leadership." Such religious training should not be merely cultural but should "help the church fulfil a religious mission, which can be accomplished only when students are educated . . . to take an active part in the church, and through the church to serve society." Thus, "while not neglecting the broader phases of education," such colleges, "would place relatively greater emphasis upon immediate, direct training for religious leadership." Moreover, in this "ideal college . . . curricula are planned with this church objective in view."

"Of the more than five hundred Christian colleges in the United States," continues the author, "at least two hundred are of . . . [this] type." And, in italics, he frankly states that he "is writing especially" to this latter group.

One cannot very well take exception to the task that any writer sets himself to accomplish or to the subject with which he sets himself to deal. But in this case the author deplores the fact that of the multitude of young people, members of the churches, who go to college of whatever sort and should "return eager for leadership in the Christian Adventure . . . not more than half of them" do so. And Dean Mathews is quoted as saying, "The Church is leaking at the top." Too true, and tragically so!

But the question arises, what can these two hundred small colleges do to change the situation? That is not a facetious nor an indifferent question. It is asked in all seriousness and sincerity. It is that question which gives the reader a sense of futility and failure in the book. Young people of our churches enter our State and privately endowed universities as undergraduates in increasingly large numbers. What can be done for these? True, Doctor Hites escapes all responsibility for answering the question by frankly limiting his study. But one must ask, What are the graduates of two hundred colleges among so many?

On the other hand, are the graduates of our State colleges and universities lost to the church in any larger proportion than are those of the Christian college? The author admits that many of his arguments for Christian education are drawn from the writings of educators in these larger institutions which indicates that they are aware of the conditions that prevail and are endeavoring to remedy them. That is, the problem and its solution is greater than that presented in the field of the Christian college only.

Again, the Christian college cannot today fulfil the purpose for which it was founded exactly as originally expected. The primary task of every such college today is to fit the student for professional life. It is the requirement of the time and if that be accomplished it would seem there is little or no room on the curriculum for those courses the author suggests as necessary for training in specific church leadership.

Is it not also true that should a college set itself this task it would necessarily become sectarian in its interests and influence rather than religious in the finest sense of that term? It was as the former these Christian colleges were organized but the demand of the developing American religious and educational system forced them to become liberal. The stream cannot be turned back upon itself.

Admittedly something must be done. Too large a proportion of college graduates do forsake the church. But is it the college or the church which is at fault? What, for instance, of the many seminaries and their attitude toward higher education and scientific studies as revealed in the views and attacks of so large a number of their professors and ministerial graduates!

Nevertheless, the book is exceedingly helpful in the study of this very important problem. It is a pioneer in the field but no significant phase of the subject, within the limits set by the author, seems to have escaped his attention and consideration. The itemized table of contents, faithfully followed in the text, reveals its comprehensiveness. Chap. I. Religious

backgrounds of the Christian college. II. Religious functions of the Christian college. III. Student backgrounds which hinder achievement. IV. Institutional factors which hinder achievement. V. Teaching religion as content and knowledge. VI. Guidance of student religious life. VII. The problem of college worship. VIII. Teaching religion through freedom under responsibility.

Yet one is inclined to feel that the suggestion, rather rejected by the author, is after all the real solution. Let the college create a true Christian atmosphere rather than seek to teach it by prescribed courses. Let the professors see there is no conflict between "science and religion," that highest education is truly religious. Only the sciences of religion can ever be taught; religion never can be, it must be exemplified.

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

The Catholic-Protestant Mind. CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN, Ph. D. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1929. Pp. 203. $2.50.

AN ever-present source of concern and trouble in the United States is the Roman Catholic question. It has been so throughout the history of the nation. The difficulty seems to center about the problem as to how any one can pledge full-hearted allegiance to a foreign power which claims authority over temporal as well as spiritual affairs and still be loyal to the Constitution.

The question was raised in the very early years of the Republic, and again in the second quarter of the nineteenth century when emigration swept swiftly to our shores. It gave rise to many parties and societies whose self-appointed task it was to save America from this foreign politico-religious enemy of her free institutions. It has been very much to the fore in these latter days when the schools of the Church have rapidly increased in number and a loyal son has aspired to the office of the Chief Executive of the nation. It seemed to some good citizens that all which America held dear was in danger of destruction and loss.

It is time that some one should turn the light of intelligence and sanity upon this source of recurring disturbance and let us calmly and clearly see the facts. This Professor Moehlman has done. He shows us by a wealth of quotations from reliable Roman Catholic sources, that the doctrines, claims, and "avowed purposes" of the Church are not "always, everywhere, the same." No one today gives heed to the designation, Pope-King. It is an empty title, without significance, its origin and meaning to be read in the glorious history of past ages, but upon the recognition of which no one would now insist, least of all, perhaps, the Pope himself.

The doctrine of infallibility in spiritual matters is a mere compensation and consolation for the present impotence in temporal affairs. A new world physically, geographically, astronomically, intellectually has come since those claims were first made and they are therefore now recognized as vain.

So far as America is concerned, the Constitution will always be recognized as supreme by Roman Catholics. That battle was fought and won in the early days of the Republic's history. The Church in America insisted upon being American rather than being strictly Roman and almost the complete break came. During the years since, the great leaders of the Church in this land have boldly declared their Americanism and have championed the cause of complete religious liberty, the absolute separation of Church and State.

On the other hand, the author sets forth the right of the Parochial School, and, from statistics, shows the needlessness of fearing its effect upon our national life in any particular. So, likewise, statistics are given indicating that the numerical strength of Roman Catholics in proportion to the population in America is on the decline.

Above all, it is a wholesome book whose kindly, tolerant spirit is calculated not only to allay the fears of a religious war or the loss of cherished principles but, what is much more worthy, to develop the same tolerant spirit in all who read it and a desire to unite the religious forces of the nation in warfare upon the real evils which beset our national welfare.

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

Fighters for Freedom. AUSTEN KENNEDY DE BLOIS, Ph. D., D. D., LL. D. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1929. Pp. 425. $1.50.

THE religious passion and marvelous achievement of seventeen men, who have been crusaders in some phase of humanity's victorious cause of freedom, is here told by Doctor de Blois in his own brilliant and stirring style. The first faint gleam of that triumph is witnessed in the life and message of Arnold of Brescia, lighting a little flame in that seeming utter darkness of the twelfth century. Then came these others, ever gaining in strength, who won complete religious freedom for the western world—Peter Waldo, Balthasar Hübmaier, Menno Simons, John Smyth, John Bunyan, Roger Williams, John Clarke, Obadiah Holmes. But the task was not yet done! Conscious of the debt in their own emancipation and enlightenment, there went out others of equal heroic and devoted spirit to the destitute and enslaved of all lands—John Howard, Andrew Fuller, William Carey, Adoniram Judson, Luther Rice, John Mason Peck, William Knibb, Francis Wayland.

The author has done his work well. The stories are well told and will have historical and inspirational value in missionary studies for which they are designed. Doctor de Blois is right, when disregarding any form of baptism, he includes all these great leaders within the Baptist fold. For, as he declares, " the fundamental contentions of outstanding Baptist leaders were nourished by the passion for every form of honorable human freedom " . . . and " spiritual democracy " . . . " above all else, is the contribution that Baptists have made to the religious life and thought of the ages." Thus all these men, whatever their nationalities or other religious practises, are Baptists, because " It was the Baptist principle, the zeal for human liberty and human rights, that drove them forward." Doctor de Blois has here in very deed emphasized the true historical characteristic of the Baptists.

Two slight criticisms may, however, be made. In the light of this insistence upon the championship of human liberty in all its forms as being the undoubted Baptist principle it is strange to find the author writing regarding Roger Williams—concerning whom there is not the slightest authentic evidence that he ever was immersed—" his unswerving belief in baptism by immersion and in a regenerate church-membership appears also in his later writings."

There is a tendency also perhaps to speak in terms unnecessarily severe and denunciatory of the opponents and persecutors of some of these heroes. Such phrases as " taste for blood " and "sneaking espionage" are scarcely justifiable when we remember that these prosecutors, cruel though they may seem to us, were nevertheless intensely sincere and firm believers in the righteousness of their views.

R. E. E. Harkness.

Economic Causes of the Reformation in England. Oscar Albert Marti, Ph. D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 254. $2.50.

Historians of the Christian Church have long recognized the involved factors of the Protestant Reformation in England. The break with Rome came during the reign of Henry VIII. But certainly the cause was not the king's well-known domestic troubles or amours—as the fact that his love-letters lie in the most central place in the Vatican Library might indicate. Numerous other elements enter in, as all are aware. Nor did the English Reformation begin within that reign. Its origin lies far in the centuries preceding, at least as far back in the past as the time of the Magna Charta. Nor was it completed until, perhaps, the coming of William and Mary to the throne as constitutional monarchs. It's a long and challenging story!

No one has yet written it as it may some day be written. Perhaps it is too much to expect that any one person can. There are too many fields for investigation, not one of which has hitherto been adequately explored. What was the contribution of the growing nationalism; of trade and commerce; of new world discoveries; of necessary economic adjustments; of the new sciences; of humanism? Each one of these, as of others, might well constitute a life study in itself.

All students of this section of the history of the Church will therefore welcome this work of Doctor Marti. His researches have given us authoritative estimates of the economic conditions prevailing throughout the nation during the period from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century inclusive.

His first chapter reveals the disproportionate wealth of the English clergy, "and its bearing on the daily life of the people." Without piling up statistics that hamper the easy progress of reading we discover clearly the vast possessions of this class in lands, goods, and pounds sterling.

The second chapter depicts the revolt of the people, dispossessed and burden-bearing, against this Papal system in the thirteenth century. Then follows the work of Wyclif, mainly, as presenting the "Motives and Movements toward the Disendowment of the English Clergy." The fourth carries this revolt of the people into the Reformation Parliament of the sixteenth century. And the fifth and final chapter tells the story of the "Economic Factors Tending toward the Final Secularization of Church Property in England, 1533-1539."

As indicated above, the book is very readable. It suggests, what is true indeed of all such reformations, that the origin lies not within theology or with Church leaders, but in the social condition of the people which requires amelioration and just restoration.

A very complete bibliography is appended and the list of "notes and references" is also very extensive.

R. E. E. Harkness.

Things that Remain. The Bolen Lectures, 1928. Carl E. Grammer. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 219.

Doctor Grammer is the well-known rector of St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia, one of the most scholarly and open-minded of the Protestant Episcopal clergy. He attempts to answer the question, What is left of Christianity that will bear the modern analysis? He finds that much is left, all that the believer really needs.

In the chapter on Man Doctor Grammer gives us the key to his argu-

ment: "The methods of science can never overthrow an instinctive and inevitable judgment of common sense, like our belief in the uniqueness of our personality. For what is the basis of science itself, but the instinctive and inevitable judgment of common sense that the external world is a reality and that the senses are to be trusted." He applies this principle with increasing cogency and success as he examines the grounds of our belief in the Existence of God, in the Personality of God, and is at his best in the following chapter on Inspiration.

The chapters on Providence and Miracle are the least satisfactory. Doctor Grammer does not face the real difficulty in the old belief in special providences, which is that it implies a God different from the God whom Jesus reveals to us, who loves with an impartial love and causes his sun to shine alike on just and unjust. Nor does he face the real difficulty in the question of miracle, when he argues that "what is impossible with men may be possible with God." No theist will question that God *can* work a miracle: the question is, Does he? And modern science has led us so to trust in the dependability and uniformity of nature as to make miracle no longer thinkable for many.

But these are slight deductions from the total value of the book. To read it demands close attention and challenges one's best reasoning powers. It will not be an acceptable substitute for the latest novel, but the style is strong and clear, and the pages richly repay a careful reading by any one who is not afraid to think.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

The Saviors of Mankind. WILLIAM R. VAN BUSKIRK. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 537. $3.00.

THIS is a series of well-told stories of eleven "saviors of mankind," among whom are included Akhnaton, Isaiah of Babylon, Socrates, and Saul of Tarsus. It is rather surprising to find these names listed with Lao-Tze, Confucius, Gautama, Zoroaster, Moses, Jesus of Nazareth, and Mahomet, the usually recognized founders of new religious movements. The reason is that the author is not aiming to give another book on the history of religions, so-called. Nor does he tabulate the creeds and rituals of the world's religions in order to note the relative values of each. His interest is in the actual service rendered to mankind by each of the "saviors" considered in this volume. By "saviors" he means the rescue of men from their experienced evils, specially their social vices and their misconceptions of the nature of the Power that controls and directs. He portrays the life and work of each "savior" from the point of view of the functional value of religion in his own racial and cultural environment,

and evaluates his contribution to the total values that have emerged in the progress of the human race.

The volume will serve as a good introduction to a more detailed study of the world's great religions; indeed, it will stimulate to such study. If it should do this, many pastors will find valuable material for their public instruction. The author is pastor of the Odell Avenue Presbyterian Church, Marshall, Missouri. During his busy pastorate he finds time to make special investigations into some field of research. One of the results of his organized study is the book which he has called *The Saviors of Mankind.*

MILTON G. EVANS.

The Religious Response. HENRY WILKES WRIGHT. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1929. Pp. 256.

THE author is Professor of Philosophy in the University of Manitoba. "The book has grown out of popular addresses in which the author has defined the philosophical aspects of religion in non-academic terms."

The subject of the first chapter is given as the title of the volume. The second chapter, entitled "The Problem of Religion," begins enticingly:

> Religion we propose to understand as a response, on the part of the human individual, of personal confidence in the real universe. We have now to consider the problem which this response and the faith behind it create for modern thought. Why, we may wonder, does any problem arise at all? Confidence in the Supreme Cosmic Power has been produced in the minds of a large proportion of mankind by their experience of life and the world; and they have expressed the confidence they have felt by appropriate words and acts. Why need any intellectual or theoretical difficulty intrude itself? Nevertheless, a problem does arise and its source is to be found in an assumption as to the nature of the world which underlies the religious response. Indeed it is not too much to say that a definite view of the world is implied in religious faith. Man can in reason *trust* a Universe only if he believes it trustworthy. And he can regard it as trustworthy only if he attributes to it an appreciation of the values which he holds highest, those of personal character and personal association, and a purpose and a power to realize these values. This assumption concerning the nature of the world it is which creates the theoretical or philosophical problem of religion. Human thought is bound to inquire: Is the religious view of the world as truly worthy of man's trust and confidence rationally justifiable in view of the facts of human experience and the attested conclusions of human science?

Chapter three briefly but pointedly reviews "Discarded Conceptions of the Spiritual," closing with the challenging paragraph:

> In the face of this record of defeat and failure it requires courage to assert that there is a spiritual interpretation of the world which is rationally tenable, one which is not inconsistent with the results of science and which is supported by the

facts of observation and experiment. Yet this is the claim I shall try to substantiate in the chapters which follow.

Then follow nine chapters, bearing the titles: The World of Physical Science, The World of Every-day Perception, Its Two Aspects; The Responses of Appreciation vs. the Responses of Action; How Objects Are Related in Their Aspect of Value; How These Relations Are Verified; The Objective System of Values as the Spiritual World; Does the Objective System of Values Imply a Cosmic Intelligence? Religion and Morality; The Religion of Experience and Experiment.

In the development of his argument the author, as most recent writers, shows the influence of Hoeffding, but more decidedly argues for an objective system of values. Interesting is his treatment of what is meant by experience in religion. While religious inquiry is different from scientific investigation, nevertheless a truly experimental procedure is possible in religion. But the experimenter must have some clear notion of the field in which he is experimenting; he must have some acquaintance with the technical methods appropriate to his field; he must know the results gained by earlier experimenters in the same field. Applying these principles, Professor Wright holds that prayer, devoted service and worship are the appropriate and effective requirements for verification of the "reality" of values. "It is the peculiar distinction of Christianity that it exalts in the person of its Founder, a life and character which perfectly exemplifies and effectively communicates these values in their complete and convincing unity."

MILTON G. EVANS.

The Christian God. RICHARD ROBERTS. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 154.

THIS is a little book. Its worth, however, is out of proportion to its size. It is an admirable example of the preacher's art. The author discusses a most difficult theme with rare skill in use of his material and in literary presentation. He knows the fields of recent biological and psychological research and easily adduces illustrations from each field to clarify and make attractive his logic. He is aware that he is not *proving* his theme. He simply adduces analogies from the sciences to show that processes in the field of religion are sufficiently established to be regarded as trustworthy basis for action. It is not an intellectual sin to trust our religious experience.

The author is a busy pastor. He has been much in demand as special lecturer in colleges and universities. The present volume contains the Merrick Lectures delivered at Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio,

in December, 1928. He acknowledges his sources for his material in a brief bibliography, but these have been only the stimulus to real creative thinking on his own part. The art of vivid portrayal and illuminating allusion is his own. To learn how to present old themes in a surprisingly interesting and suggestive way, read the six lectures comprising the volume: Prayer and Revelation; The Christian Event; God in Christ; The Image of God; Disharmony; Atonement.

MILTON G. EVANS.

Prayer. MARIO PUGLISI. Translated by BERNARD M. ALLEN. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 296. $2.50.

THIS is not just another book on prayer. It is the book on prayer which every one should read. It is the fruit of many years of research and reflection of one of the most influential religious thinkers of Europe. It is no exaggeration to say that this study on prayer ranks Puglisi with men like Heiler, Otto, and Ménégoz.

As early as 1912 Puglisi published *La Teologia di Aristotele,* which attracted considerable attention. This was followed in quite rapid succession by a series of books covering the whole range of inquiry into the origin and history of religion, the psychology of religion, and the philosophy of religion. In 1900 he founded the "Association for Moral and Religious Progress," and published the review entitled *Il Progresso Religioso,* devoted to the discussion of philosophical and religious questions. By these agencies and through frequent contributions to various religious journals and by publishing about thirty volumes he has been acquainting Italy with the teachings of liberal Christianity. American readers who wish to know what spirit the Pope condemned in his famous encyclical against Modernism should become acquainted with Puglisi's career as lecturer and writer.

The volume on Prayer, his most recent important work, contains the substance of four courses of lectures delivered at Florence, Turin, Palermo, and Rome. His hearers requested that the world be given an opportunity to read what they had been privileged to hear. His reputation in his own country is expressed by the Honorable Professor Vazzani of the University of Turin in the words, " One of the few Italian religious scholars who combines deep learning with a broad and clear outlook, and who possesses a well-balanced mind, sound judgment, and a wide and thorough training in philosophy, psychology, and history, ripened by long years of study and by direct personal contact with leading religious thinkers."

The book has four parts. The first part gives current views on the question of prayer, an exhaustive review of the many methods by which

prayer has been studied, and a brief statement of the unity and universality of prayer, a continuous union of man with the object of prayer, from the first cry of the child in the dark to the unknown to discover whether there be one to answer, to the assured conviction of the race that has created logically articulated creed and elaborate symbolical worship.

The second part is a historical survey of the variety of forms prayer has assumed among different races and at different periods in the history of each religion.

Part Three treats of the meaning and value of prayer, and classifies the types of prayer, illustrating the varied manifestations of the human personality in relation to the object of prayer, for example, the eudæmonistic prayer, the æsthetic prayer, the nœtic prayer, and the ethical prayer.

Part Four is in some respects the most suggestive although the briefest of the four parts. Its main theme is "Prayer in the Religious Life of Today." It is a fine discussion of contemporary religious thought and feeling. It shows the place and value of prayer in life both in the individual conscience and in the organized church.

To quote the closing sentences of the book may induce the reader of this notice to read the entire volume in order to follow the argument that leads to such an inspiring conclusion:

> The religious life of today is finding once more the way out of a barren desert in which it seemed to be pining away, and its prayer gives glimpses of a yearning vision for justice and love. As one listens to that prayer it seems as though a new soul were arising with a faith that has power to prepare the way for the future, and were marching confidently forward, knowing that from the valley of this world and its griefs the road stretches that leads upwards to the topmost heights. If praying means creating and maintaining in the heart those high desires which enable man to live apart from wickedness and from all that estranges from the life of the spirit; if praying means a full consciousness of his own nature and his own destiny, a mounting up, an ineffable fusion of the human life in the Divine—then there should be no doubt that the metaphysical problem of prayer finds its full solution in that moral action which, while seeking to make the human will one with the Divine, also asks that it may, as reason bids, be made one with the laws of nature.
>
> It is such prayer that may mark a fresh starting-point in human history. History is, according to Nietzsche, the progress of man toward power; according to Italian Neo-Hegelianism it is the progress of man toward liberty. But history is something richer and fuller than either. It is above all else a gradual development of the human consciousness as it passes from the exercise of power and of liberty to the realm of those moral values from which life attains to its greatest fulness in the harmony of the universe. In such a vision of history prayer can today be seen scattering from its beneficent hand seeds that bear within them the promise of a nobler Humanity.

MILTON G. EVANS.

What Do We Mean by God? Some Studies in the Objectivity of Christian Experience. CYRIL H. VALENTINE, M. A., Ph. D. (London). New York: The Macmillan Company.

A PRELIMINARY essay on the validity of Christian experience by this author leaves the reader wishing he had the book at hand for reference.

This discussion is of course the fundamental issue for religion. Can the object of religious faith be allowed to have ultimate reality? As recent psychology challenges the objectivity of religious experience, or yields only qualified recognition, religion, unless the challenge be met, will give way, as in many writers it seems already to have done, to science, art, or philosophy. If God be not objective reality we may have psychology of religion, history of religion, but not theology or the religion of which theology is the intellectual presentation.

The author's question is: What is the least we can mean by "God," if we are to mean anything adequate to the name? The answer must be such as can endure the tests of modern science, philosophy, and, of course, of religion itself also. The test of religion is too often not taken seriously. His answer is that the least we can mean by "God" for religion is *Objective Reality Responsive to Human Personality.*

He does not look for his material support to the Scriptures as revelation, nor to the traditions of the church. He finds his confirmations in human experience on its varied levels in religion, which latter he regards as essentially a mutual response between personality and reality, which reality is by him regarded as ultimately personal.

His contention therefore fronts, for criticism and contradiction, the present-day disposition "to construe the idea of God as subjective in character; a mistaken projection of human mind." His argument proceeds relentlessly in this direction: and while he appears at times to concede more than a satisfactory theism can endure, and may even verge perilously toward pantheism, his exactions in logic from science and only lesser exactions from philosophy, make apparently impregnable his claims for his thesis.

It is not, however, to be supposed that the author means to antagonize either science or philosophy; rather he insists that deference must be paid them, and the concept "God" must submit to the tests of these disciplines. "Religion is the better for fellowship with science and philosophy." His argument seems to be that any theory of reality which fails to include personality is necessarily defective, and is not so much to be contradicted as supplemented. Reality, with which both science and philosophy are concerned—reality is a system, and as such must not leave out personality

from its "the whole"; for personality is an integral element in the system which reality is. "Personality is the highest order of system known to the human mind, and a system of reality which did not include personality as an essential factor would be only a partial system after all, and could not represent the nature of the ultimately real. Personality, therefore, is a factor which must be reckoned with in any final synthesis."

The author's thesis simply goes beyond the premises allowed by science and philosophy and insists that personality is necessary to any complete system of reality. If this premise can be justified, then common ground is reached and the conception of God is allowable to both philosophy and science. Unless it be insisted that, and shown that, reality excludes personality, neither is compelled by its nature as a discipline or by its rational contentions to exclude God as objective and responsive Reality.

In fact, personality lies outside the scope of science, which seeks to find a system in which personality is not a factor, while psychology has not yet regarded personality as the one important subject for investigation. But "the mind that knows must be one of the terms in 'the whole' which includes all that may be known—Personality must make one in the great company of reals."

This work, in each succeeding chapter, intrigues the reader in a deeper sense than usual in such discussions. It keeps its main contention in mind, and yet, in each chapter approaches from a fresh aspect of the problem. If we may be permitted the illustration, each chapter is like a new movement in a vast symphony, which not only is new, but gives a deeper insight into the involvements of the theme, and reveals the richer harmony of the whole of reality. The author's "least we can mean by God," namely—Objective Reality [which must be ultimately personal] Responsive to Human Personality, becomes a mine of religious value and significance, to which no review can do justice. The book should be read and will repay devout study.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

Whither Christianity. Edited by LYNN HAROLD HOUGH. New York and London: Harper Brothers.

IN fifteen chapters, some fourteen more or less distinguished men attempt to cover the various phrases of modern theological belief and religious practise "in terms of contemporary intelligence."

Generally speaking, group writings of this sort by American authors do not come up to the level of the work of certain English groups, who engage to, and actually accomplish, a unity of treatment and something of

a common style and sequence that is more than formal, more than writings on the topics of a theological catalogue.

Possibly this is due in part to the distances which separate the writers, and which make difficult if not impossible frequent assemblies of the American writers, in which they might, with academic zeal and religious fervor, beat and blend or even weld their ideas into a unity. These addresses are not a whole in spirit or feeling. They are simply a collection. They do not bear strongly to any one theme and drive it home. They are not a drama, or tragedy, or even a cult; but simply more or less brilliant samples of a way of theological thinking—a [pardon the figure] theological vaudeville.

Perhaps other reasons for this failure to reach the level of English works of this sort might be found in the depth as well as breadth of the academic training of the two peoples; possibly in the dynamic of the religion fervor of "the intelligentsia" of the English and their capacity to lose themselves in a cause. In any event, one misses in this form of writing by American collaborators what he finds in that same form among their neighbors in England, namely, the urge of a common mind, a common faith, a common will, and a common love.

Nevertheless we have in this volume, *Whither Christianity*, some brilliant writing, some aflame with the genius of the Spirit. The chapters by Richard Roberts, Miles H. Krumbine, and Gaius Glenn Atkins are only lesser classics in virility of thought, in comprehension of the problems and in the simplicity and beauty of style.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

"The Lord of Life—A Fresh Approach to the Incarnation." By a group of authors of The Swanwick Free Church Fellowship. New York: Macmillan Company.

THIS book of more than 300 pages has as its aim to work out a presentation of Christ that may meet the needs of men today. Its spirit is therefore vital rather than theoretic, and its hope that it will find verification in the full range of human experience. The group of writers follow a definite and deliberate line of approach, *the experimental rather than speculative*. The chapters are not independent contributions, but the product of thought and experience shared and compared. The result is highly satisfactory as constituting a consistent whole.

It may be of no great moment that the reviewer is agreed that this is no less the right and only adequate approach than it is the dynamic result desired, since it is both religious and theological. One may not challenge the subtitle "A Fresh Approach" so far as theological treatment of

an academic sort is concerned, and yet even here the method is not new. The method has been less emphasized and noted, but has not been overlooked by American theologians, notably William Newton Clarke and Olin A. Curtis. In theology the method may be novel, if not quite new; but to the lay mind and the non-academic faith it is perfectly true and familiar. It is no novel method to those whose experience of salvation and moral enabling through faith in Jesus Christ has been the one ground of their conviction that "God was in Christ."

In this book we have the superb value of a theological elaboration of the commonly sensed reality of "God in Christ" as experienced in the salvation upon faith in him. Here too this ground of faith is justified in reason and history.

In some respects the discussion of the Christologies from the patristic to the modern by Vernon Bartlett, constitute the most satisfactory history of the doctrine of the Incarnation it has been our good fortune to read.

No resumé of the contents can possibly be a substitute for the reading of these equally devout and scholarly chapters.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

If I Had Only One Sermon to Preach on Immortality. Edited by WILLIAM L. STIDGER. New York and London: Harper & Brothers.

TWENTY-THREE sermons on the topic "Immortality" by as many ministers save one, a layman, Mr. George W. Coleman. With an almost incredible diversity of approach and treatment these writers affirm their faith and seek to add confirmation to the faith of others. Although these contributions are in reply to the implied question of the title of the book one feels that few of the replies are representative of the best the writers could do, or really possess as the basis of their conviction. The limits of such a form of presentation necessarily impose, at least counsel restraint, a restraint that is no aid to genius or the richest expression of one's convictions.

Nevertheless there is a wealth of convincing material which taken as a whole is of value to any student. The sermons are by no means of equal worth and a few are almost without any especial worth. One wonders why that by His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell was included in the volume. It looks as if he replied that if he had only one sermon to preach on immortality he wouldn't preach it. Several readers agree on the vigor and freshness of the sermons by Rabbi Harry Levi, Francis J. McConnell, and Henry Hallam Saunderson. On the whole the word of Mr. George W. Coleman seems second to few, very few. Nevertheless

here are sermons by Doctors Cadman, Fosdick, Hough, John Hutton, Jefferson, Newton, Norwood, and Agnes Maude Royden. The volume deserves and will most likely have a wide reading and may help some go " forth with a new certainty of life's eternal values and a new faith in the immortality of the soul " as the capable Editor, Dr. William L. Stidger, prophesies will be the case.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

Science and the Unseen World. ARTHUR STANLEY EDDINGTON, F. R. S., author of *The Nature of the Physical World.* New York: The Macmillan Company.

" EVERY religiously minded reader of the last four chapters of *The Nature of the Physical World* will be eager to lay hold of these additional observations of the foremost living exponent of the seen in regard to the unseen world."

So the publishers present this small volume, and to this we enthusiastically assent; while adding further that, whether one followed or could not easily follow the author in his larger work, he will find here, if a brief, nevertheless a convincing statement of the views of this distinguished astronomer and physicist as to what science may or not mean as to religion. It is the Swarthmore Lecture, 1929, established by the Woodbroke Extension Committee, relating to the message and work of the Society of Friends, England.

There are many concessions of a comforting sort to those who are disturbed by the attitude of some scientists; and also some clear affirmations which should give the brood of lesser scientists reason for pause and poise. " Scientific theories have blundered in the past. They blunder no doubt today "—a phrase which is begotten of sincere humility, and indicates the spirit of the author, both toward science—the seen, and religion—the unseen. The crude materialistic view he utterly disavows in the name of science, as " entirely out of keeping with recent changes of thought as to the fundamental principles of physics." Or " Materialism in its literal sense is long since dead."

Physical science has turned its back on the machine model type of explanation, thinks of it now as a hindrance to the apprehension of truth behind the phenomena. Its ideal of a scientific explanation has changed beyond recognition. It no longer identifies " the real with the concrete." We all share " the strange delusion " that matter is easily comprehensible while the nature of the human spirit is unfathomable. But all our " knowledge " of the physical universe is symbolic. What we have is a real and not merely symbolic knowledge of our own nature. It seems inadequate to attempt to describe mind in terms of physics, and so mind

seems mysterious. "In comparing the certainty of things spiritual and things temporal, let us not forget this—Mind is the first and most direct thing in our experience; all else is remote inference."

But now is the unseen world revealed by the mystical outlook a reality, or is one facing the hard facts of experience when he follows this outlook? The author affirms that consciousness is not wholly or even primarily a device for receiving sense impressions, and that we may insist that there is another outlook than the scientific one, and in practise, a more transcendental outlook is almost universally admitted. Philosophy is on trial. It must find room for this experience as an element of life. "The sense of values within us recognizes that this is a test that must be passed; it is as essential that our philosophy should survive this test as that it should survive the experimental tests supplied by science." In the attempt to incorporate the material of such an outlook in our conception of reality we are not doing an irrational thing but obeying the leading of truth.

Though materialism is dead, other philosophies with a virtually equivalent outlook have been presented, such as a belief in the dominance of scientific law. Confused conceptions of "law" are misleading thought. Scientific law is identified with "something in the constitution of things which makes its non-fulfilment an impossibility." But law in this sense, "Natural law," is not applicable to the unseen world, cannot be applied "to the parts of our personality which are not measurable by symbols any more than you can extract the square root of a sonnet." This confusion in our use of the word "law" has not been adequately recognized. The author is emphatic when he writes, "Dismiss the idea that natural law may swallow up religion; it cannot even tackle the multiplication table single-handed." And so the deterministic view as a comprehensive explanation slips to a lower and partial accounting of things.

What the religion-minded person wants is assurance that, in reaching out to an unseen world, he is not following an illusion. "We do not want a religion that deceives us for our good." Does God really exist? But here the reader must be referred to the text of the author, which for the reviewer is eminently satisfying. Enough to note this word or two:

"It is I think of the very essence of the unseen world that the conception of personality should dominate it. Force, energy, dimensions belong to the world of symbols: . . . What other conceptions have we? After exhausting physical methods we returned to the innermost recesses of consciousness, to the voice that proclaims our personality; and from there we entered on a new outlook. We have to build the spiritual world out of symbols taken from our own personality, as we build the scientific

world out of the symbols of the mathematician. I think therefore we are not wrong in embodying the significance of the spiritual world to ourselves in the feeling of a personal relationship, for our whole approach to it is bound up with those aspects of consciousness in which personality is centered."

SPENSER B. MEESER.

"The Primitive Church." CANON B. H. STREETER. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 323. $2.50.

"Baptist Churches in Action." G. S. DOBBINS. Nashville: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. Pp. 220. $1.50.

THESE volumes, both dealing with church polity, may be reviewed together with profit. Canon Streeter is pressing the fact that all Christian denominations claim to root their respective polities in the New Testament, and in grace grants that each has succeeded in building up a good case. He advances the further suggestive fact that while each thus succeeds, each is powerless to demolish the case of the other. "Why?" he asks. The volume is given to the answer of his own question, particularly as it relates to the rise of the ministry of the Church. His findings grow out of an objective, scientific study of early Christian literature, the New Testament primarily. His interesting conclusion is that there is no single type of polity given in the New Testament or found in the apostolic period. On the contrary the various types existed in embryo, hence each denomination finds vindication for its own claims.

Professor Dobbins presents a remarkably complete and comprehensive hand-book for Southern Baptists. Early sections are given to the rise and development of Baptist polity, an onward flowing stream whose springs are in the New Testament—and moreover all fountains therein issue in the Baptist type, namely, the democratic type of polity. By inference at least other Christian bodies have no legitimate claim for their type in the New Testament.

As the unbiased mind reads these two volumes he is impressed that one is written in the primary interest of truth, while the other aims chiefly to make better denominationalists; and each will go, as it is written of one, "to his own place."

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

Vision and Authority. JOHN OMAN. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1929. Pp. 352. $3.00.

Every age has its own task of interpreting its own experiences, and no age has found itself to need less than all its faith and all its labour.

OURS is an age of undeniable difficulties for faith and belief; there is great uncertainty as to what remains unshaken and unshakable. In such

a time the supreme problem is that of authority. What and where is that word of God which men can and ought to obey? Is it not to be found in that inner vision without which a man perishes, which alone may speak to him in mandatory tones, and which at the same time establishes him in freedom?

Modern science reveals a universe which makes progress from necessity to freedom, from physical laws to a kingdom of love. This is the story told by evolution. Even in the vast material universe man is not lost, for it is his mind that comprehends that vastness, discovers the laws of its unfolding, and demands that it become a temple wherein he may worship, kindling within himself the vision of that Galilean whose kingdom has no limit and no end, a vision which speaks with authority.

Man's quest is for Truth, nothing less than which can satisfy. He believes Truth and God to be one. Advancing on his quest, discipline and duty give him direction; the modest, hungry, open mind of the little child contributes sincere and expectant attitude, the attitude of the genuine seeker; while full confidence in the trustworthiness of his own faculties burnishes hope and keeps assurance new every day.

With the trembling of a delicate nerve as his sole guidance, man marches more confidently through life than if he were guided by a fellow mortal or even led by the hand of an angel.

Spiritual insight, in its degree, is a like authority and confers a like security.

Not by the blind leading the blind, not even by the seeing leading the blind, but by every man following the direction of his own spiritual vision, will men walk with assured steps along the highway of life; and find it commodious enough for all.

Thus advancing will men come to unity; not the unity of mere conformity, rather that vital unity in the Truth upon which men as individual seekers converge. Individual seekers? Surely, but not lone seekers, for each journeys with the many and each proffers his own insight for the other's consideration.

Only those who are adaptable, sympathetic, loyal to conviction, humble in service, keep their spiritual vision fresh, and find it of a keenness, sureness, and range adequate to the necessities both of their belief and their practise, whether of the most intimate private guidance or of the most public and wide association.

The age greatly needs the prophet who can interpret to man his own total environment, teach him that the fit who survive are the morally fit, reveal to him that victory belongs not to the mighty but to the holy, and instruct him to discern that the secret of life resides not in self-love, but in love.

If [on the contrary] man has no knowledge of Divine things, if he cannot think God's thoughts and know God's will, if he has no consciousness of truth and no conscience of right, if the goal of his labors is not freedom, if he cannot discern something of his place in God's universe and do something to fill it, if he is not, both in his own soul and in his mortal life, in the last resort a spiritual fact, we should not speak of religion, but of physics, and recognize that the ultimate explanation of all things is not love but mathematics.

If therefore the life of a man is only a mathematical formula, an external authority is both legitimate and necessary for his mastery. But if he be a free spirit made in the image of God, then what? Book II assumes the task of answering, of considering the relation of inner vision to outer authority, of setting forth that one and only condition in which they may not issue in a death-inviting conflict. Jesus as a Divine Teacher "spake as no man ever spake," because what he taught fused the authority of the inner vision and the outer word. In Him is found the abolition of conflict, a condition which the true Church will maintain in perpetuity.

In the light of the discussion in Books I and II, the author proceeds in Book III to consider "The Church's Creed" and in Book IV, "The Church's Organization."

Such a volume cannot be adequately reviewed. Who may assay to review a "Hamlet," or a "Fifth Symphony"? Of this work, Doctor John A. Hutton writes in the *British Weekly,* "It is the deepest and most decisive theological discussion of life which has appeared in English in our generation." A rewarding book for the thoughtful, open-minded reader.

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

The Master's Memorial. SAMUEL BLAIR. Nashville: Cokesbury Press. 1929. Pp. 200. $2.00.

THE author, whose task is largely editorial, has brought together in this volume a collection of material designed to enrich and beautify the celebration of The Lord's Supper. Some thirty outstanding clergymen and masters of music have contributed appropriate prayers, meditations, sermons, and music. To this material the author adds helpful thoughts on calendar materials, physical setting, prayerful preparation, and similar details.

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

A Great Evangelism. SAMUEL G. NEIL. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1929. Pp. 245. $1.50.

DOCTOR NEIL is Bible and Field Secretary of The American Baptist Publication Society. Whether as pastor of The Second Baptist Church, Phila-

delphia, as chapel car missionary, or Field Secretary, the author is always the evangelist. Evangelism is the passion of his life, he could be naught else. Such a man has a right to speak on this theme, "The Great Evangelism," which is at once the heading of Chapter IV, and the title of his book.

Other chapters are Making the Church "Go," Is Preaching Played Out? The Preacher and His Message, Every Pastor His Own Evangelist, The Sunday Evening Service, House to House Evangelism, The Gospel in the Open Air, Decision Day in the Sunday School, Evangelism in Rural Areas, and Evangelism and the Printed Page. To these are added three appendices: A., Evangelistic Illustrations; B., Devotional Messages; C., Practical Pointers.

Not a little so-called literature and preaching on Evangelism is merely the beating of old tom-toms whose call cannot possibly be answered by Christian groups whose rising culture and refinement forbid. Doctor Neil, on the contrary, issues a high-minded and passionate challenge to us all when he pleads for a deepening of our love for and loyalty to Christ in personal life as the first great need. When this need is met in us and our churches, thus walking with him, we shall catch the passion of the Master heart and become evangelistic as a normal result.

We like the sane, hot, expulsive spirit of *A Great Evangelism,* and therefore commend its calm, prayerful reading by him who is conscious of a growing coldness of heart, and by all who greatly desire to be better evangelists.

William R. McNutt.

Evangelism. Herman C. Weber. Macmillan. 1929. Pp. 208. $2.00.

At once an audit and an evaluation of the results of evangelism in and among the churches over a period of a half century. The author is not making a study of method primarily but rather of the corralable results of all the methods employed. Vast quantities of data are assembled, presented by graphs and charts, then significantly interpreted. The approach is not only unique but meaningful. We consider this the best scientific study yet given us in this important field.

Evangelism is a vital, major function of the Church of Christ. In a right perspective it would appear somewhere as follows: Prayer—the church talks with God; Education—the church learns from God; Stewardship—the church decides for God; *Evangelism*—the church works for God; Service—the church works like God. Thus viewed evangelism is one element in an enriched program of a church and "not an isolated or spasmodic activity."

A comparative study of the vital statistics on evangelism, statistics largely gleaned from the various Year Books, leads the author to establish an index or norm of 5.6, that is an addition of 5.6 members annually per one hundred members already in the churches is the normal increase. Thence he proceeds to discover the fluctuations relative to this index, and also to determine the cause.

One graph is typical, that of the Presbyterians, for whom quite adequate statistics are available over a period of one hundred years, 1830-1930. In 1832 the line of increase rises to 15.7, under the Finney revival. The end of that decade saw dissension within the body and a corresponding descent of the line to 4.8. This condition prevailed almost uniformly until the schism was healed in 1870 when the evangelistic fruitage rose to 7.5. The graph reveals war, religious controversy, and labor troubles as causes for a downward plunge of the line, while good-will, revivals, new era movements, and the like send the same line sharply upward. Comment is unnecessary.

The same positive tendencies show up in each denominational graph, and again in a graph for a combination of the seven major Protestant groups. The results of the whole study are arresting in their interest and humiliating in their import—particularly so in an era of controversy. Verily men may not defy the basic laws of the spiritual life and yet hope for prosperity in the kingdom.

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

F. B. Meyer, Preacher, Teacher, Man of God. A. CHESTER MANN. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1929. Pp. 220. $2.00.

SCARCELY a "Life," but rather a partial record of the life of a very interesting and charming man. Meyer was indeed a "Man of God," a rare combination of quiet mystic and fiery crusader. Few men, if any, spoke more helpfully to his generation. The author has done us all a beautiful service in bringing together these biographical notes, and casting over them the charm of his own remembrances as a personal friend.

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

The Ministry of Music in Religion. I. E. REYNOLDS. Nashville: The Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. 1929. Pp. 195.

The art of music is the handmaid of religion. God created all art and he created it for a definite purpose. . . [God is] the great Artist, a lover of art, a lover of system, a lover of beauty, a lover of knowledge and wisdom, and a lover of reverence. If this be true how can we be satisfied with conditions which exist relative to the services in many of our churches, where instead of reverence we have

irreverence; instead of decorum, confusion; instead of beauty, ugliness; instead of art, jazz; instead of knowledge and wisdom, ignorance and foolishness?

THIS quotation allows our author to state the problem, or rather the need, for us. The volume meets that need out of a wide experience and rich understanding. A cataloging of the various chapters will be like throwing a cartoon of the book's content on the screen: The Origin and Development of Music, and Its Place in Religion; Music and the Bible; Music as Related to World Religions; The Present-Day Church Music Program; Development of Protestant Church Music; Special Music; Physical Equipment; Ministers of Sacred Music; The Musician and His Co-Workers; Music as Considered by a Pastor; Music in the Sunday School and Young People's Work; A Church Music Educational Program.

The kind of book that ought to be thoroughly digested by every minister, every choir leader, and every one in any way responsible for musical education in the church.

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

Signs of These Times. WILLARD L. SPERRY. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co. 1929. Pp. 180. $2.00.

A SERIES of lectures by Dean Sperry of the Theological School in Harvard University, the first to be delivered under the Ayer Lectureship in the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. The lectures are six in number, bearing the respective titles: Wisdom, Attitudes, Non-Cooperation, Individualism, Humanism, Mysticism. These timely themes are dealt with in a fashion most stimulating and at times brilliant.

WISDOM

Jesus is not an innovator, he is the flower of a rich, mature wisdom. He is the wise man who interprets and evaluates platitudes. He urges men to keep their feet on the ground, to observe the signs of the times.

We Americans are beginning to lose faith in the Midas myth of unlimited natural resources and are talking of "conservation." That is a wisdom word, revealing second thought about the past and longer thought about the future. Hitherto we have been very impatient with wise men.

Even in religion we are not characterized by wisdom. Who can view our denominationalism and yet say we have followed wisdom? We have been free, but not wise. Or take our policy of financing the churches by the local congregation, a policy which generally means control of the pulpit; is it wisdom that the prophetic voice be silenced in order that the dogmas and prejudices of that congregation be pampered? There must

be, says wisdom, a certain aloofness from the dictations of those who pay the bills.

Attitudes

Given God, we Protestants have come to describe religion in terms of "attitudes." We need to define terms, particularly that we may discern between an attitude and a pose. The former is a certain vital, inner response to an objective God, the latter is merely "an account of ourselves," a posture taken by virtue of an ideal held by the self, and having no relation to an outer Reality. An attitude therefore is vital, whereas a pose is merely a standing before the mirror in an endeavor to get oneself adjusted to the sort of religious man he thinks he ought to be. Spoken prayer may be vital, or it may be the empty words of one who thinks it good form to pray.

Religious progress, among other ways, may be characterized by virtue of the fact that the attitudes of yesterday become the poses of today, and the vital of today becomes the ghosts of tomorrow.

Much current religion impresses the student primarily as a pose, and some leaders as poseurs. If this be true it is not very reassuring for vital religion. Of course an ease-loving age is apt in assuming poses, and very slow to lay hold upon challenging, life-compelling attitudes.

Wisdom pronounces the religious pose a most unprofitable thing.

Non-Cooperation

Every advance in human history owes its advance, owes its origin to some non-cooperator. The Christian churches have best served men when they have consistently refused cooperation with "the spirit of the age," even though they have themselves contributed much to that very age. Non-cooperation has meant discontent with achievements hitherto, whereas "the spirit of the age" would rest in the *status quo*.

The underlying fact is that any particular age lives by half-truths, pronouncing them "all the truth." It therefore becomes the duty and mission of the churches to expose these half-truths and complete them by announcing their other halves.

The mind of Jesus which gave us the New Testament is a mind of mature, racial wisdom. He is always completing the half-truths which men hold. If a rich young man is too this-worldly he is told to sell what he has, or if another is too other-worldly in piously saying, "Corban," as he comes to the altar, he is counseled to go and make himself right with his offended brother. For Jesus, religion swept into its interests both this world and another, a fact which accounts for a this-world defining

of the Kingdom of Heaven on one occasion, and an other-world description thereof on another.

Religion is like a pendulum which swings through the this-worldly, other-worldly arc. It is the business of the non-cooperator to see that the pendulum does not stop.

The supreme task of present-day religious leadership is to create a proper synthesis of the Catholic-Fundamentalist other-worldliness, and the Modernist this-worldliness.

The reviewer hesitates to present digests of remaining chapters lest the reader be robbed of urge to possess this arresting volume.

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

This Is My Church. F. F. BROWN. Nashville: The Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. 1929. Pp. 63.

A LITTLE volume made up of mediocre preachments on church loyalty, the message of Baptists to the world (sufficiently sectarian), the fact of prosperity among Southern church-members, the sins of covetousness, the paltry support of the church by many, Jesus beholds this meanness, and the cooperative program. The book is "safe," and might do pre-high-school young people no great harm.

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

Missions in Principle and Practice. W. H. KNIGHT. Nashville: The Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. Pp. 190.

THE author is Professor of Missions in Southwestern Baptist Seminary and the volume under review reveals a vast amount of Bible study and analysis *of a kind*. The aim is to meet a need in the churches for a study-book in schools of missions and other groups.

Two of the ten chapters are devoted to "Missions in the Old Testament," in other words, they are commissioned to show that Jehovah was more than the God of the Israelites, and really interested in others. Three chapters follow to catalog those texts which reveal a missionary urge or movement, first, from Bethlehem to Antioch, second, from Antioch to Rome, and third, in the Epistles and Revelation.

Chapter VI runs thus: The non-Christian populations are in great need, physically, morally, and socially; their one hope does not lie in a social program, in moral reform, or in remodeling "heathen faiths." *Only Christ will suffice.* Good! Here's where the book should have begun. Christ is the beginning and the end, the inspiration and the goal of the missionary enterprise.

The concluding chapters constitute an excellent study of conditions in India, Africa, China, Japan, Latin America, Europe, and the Near East, and finally the Homeland. The work is concluded by an interesting chapter on Baptist history in the South and the present-day outlook for our cause in the Southland.

The second half of the volume is well done and worthy of commendation; but why the first half at all, and particularly the Old Testament study? For instance, to point out the confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel and the consequent scattering of peoples, in order to strain after a missionary necessity grows out of a bibliolatry that approaches the ridiculous. The pathos deepens with page after page of similar material.

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

Do the Churches Dare? CHAUNCEY J. HAWKINS. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 174. $1.50.

SOME books may be reviewed by merely reading chapter headings and a few pages here and there. There are instances in which a review so prepared is better than one from detailed reading. It is quite otherwise in the case of the book now in hand. Only a thoughtful reading of the volume satisfies the reviewer or qualifies him to treat it fairly.

Doctor Hawkins has summarized in this small book the best thinking in a very large number of works dealing with current problems in church life. At the same time he has done this in a very readable, even almost popular, and attractive style. Any attempt to summarize the contents of the work would fail certainly in doing it justice and at the same time would tend to defeat the purpose of this review. One wishes that the volume be widely read and its incisive thought together with its practical application be thoroughly considered.

Only in this way is it possible to see adequately the significance of this volume for the present condition in the churches, the meaning of evolution for theism, for the ministry of Jesus, for good teaching concerning salvation, and the meaning of all of these for church activities and especially for public worship.

It is to be feared that most of the churches do not dare, and will not soon dare, to face the situation or to accept the possibilities, but a careful study of what Doctor Hawkins has so happily sketched will greatly assist those who are at all prepared to take the needed step.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

Outfitting the Teacher of Religion. JAMES H. SNOWDEN. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 274. $2.00.

DOCTOR SNOWDEN is especially qualified to write a text-book on religious education, because of his long experience as a theological teacher and writer upon religious and educational subjects. Of the thirty volumes which have come from his pen, at least a dozen are directly concerned with the problem of teaching religion. When asked to write the present work the author was given this commission:

> Keep it within the compass of the many thousands of Sunday-school teachers who possess good minds, a good public-school education, and a real personal religious experience. Assume that your prospective readers will make an honest effort to give you their attention and possess some real desire for self-improvement in their task of exercising a formative Christian influence over the members of their classes.

This ideal has been followed throughout. The book is divided into two parts, the former dealing with the principles underlying the religious teacher's task, and the latter giving attention to the application of these principles to the work of teaching.

In carrying out his purpose to provide a text-book for the use of Sunday-school teachers and teacher-training classes, the author has endeavored to make his treatment neither too technical nor too elementary. Following each chapter there are several suggestive questions, and a brief but well-selected bibliography is provided at the end of the book.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER.

Southern Baptist Handbook. 1929. E. P. ALLDREDGE. Nashville: Baptist Sunday School Board. Pp. 388. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, $1.00.

THE author, who is secretary of the Department of Survey, Statistics, and Information of the Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention, presents his material in three parts: Part I gives a survey of the progress of the main denominations of the United States from 1916 to 1926, based on the reports of the Bureau of the Census. Part II—The Book of Numbers—is a detailed survey of the work of the Southern Baptists in 1928, showing gains, losses, contributions, properties, etc. Part III contains the directories of the Southern Baptist Conventions, State Conventions, W. M. U. Conventions, Religious Journals, ordained ministers, etc.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER.

The Heart of Words. George Roberts, D. D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 158. $1.50.

The review of this fine little book almost started with the trite expression, "to the busy pastor——etc." On second thought it seemed better to say, "to any pastor," this little book will bring not only fresh and suggestive material, but a brand new method for some of them, by which they may enliven their jaded homiletic spirits. Without any fuss or scholastic pretense, Doctor Roberts gives this unique little book to ministers and others who may be interested in such a study.

He presents about 200 words selected from the English Bible, and gives their etymological antecedents, showing the original and underlying sense in which they were used. But, better still, the author adds the most interesting illustrations which sometimes develop into very effective and beautiful homilies.

It would be useless to single out any one word. They are all good. Some of them are excellent. There is also a good index to the Bible passages used in the volume. The book will prove invaluable to any pastor who uses it as a stimulant and not as a source of supply.

George Ferguson Finnie.

Teaching Christianity. E. Morris Ferguson.

Doctor Ferguson has given the Church the sort of book that it needs. It is a question, however, whether it will read it. Folks like to be startled—they like the spectacular. There is nothing of that in this fine treatment of a most important concern for the church.

This little classic deals with elemental things. Teaching is dealt with as more than an academic activity and interest. It is viewed and discussed as a complete life pursuit, going into every field of human experience. Teaching is doing something—not being something. The function of the teacher is of more importance than the honor of the position.

Here you will find a quiet and dispassionate statement of all that is involved in teaching and learning, and from both standpoints.

The question of teaching the Bible is met and well dealt with in one whole chapter.

Project teaching and its application to the forming of Christian character, and the development of the Christian Church forms the closing chapters of the book. Thoughtful and earnest pastors and church-school workers will welcome this book and heartily thank Doctor Ferguson for its publication.

George F. Finnie.

Premillennialism and Old Testament Prediction: A Study in Interpretation. GEORGE RICKER BERRY, Professor in Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. The University of Chicago Press.

THIS is a brief study, covering only thirty-seven pages, of premillennial interpretations of the Old Testament. Such outstanding leaders of this group of interpreters as Blackstone, Newton, Gray, Gaebelein, Flynn, Haldeman, Campbell Morgan, and Schofield are quoted. Two facts are shown. First, that, while all avow that the literal interpretation of Scripture is their first principle, one and all alike are guilty of allegorizing the text. Further they ordinarily ignore the historical background of all the Old Testament writings. Thus with the utmost freedom they proceed to apply any number, word, phrase, sentence, or verse to anything and everything that has happened or will happen in earth or sky or sea. Thus each one is a law to himself, and every page of Scripture is at the mercy of the individual. Each one confirms himself in his own behalf and goes on his way rejoicing. And what rejoicing! This is perhaps garnered from a two-page quotation from a sermon of one of these well-known leaders. To read it makes us shudder. We shall repeat no phrase of it, but no page of pagan literature is farther away from the spirit of the Jesus of the New Testament than this, and no pagan conceives of his deity in more bloodthirsty terms than those expressed by this preacher.

The author briefly but adequately shows that the essential nature of the Old Testament rests not on its program of the future but on the ideas and ideals that it embodies.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

In Search of God: An Appreciation of the Ancient Hebrew Literature. JOHN WALKER POWELL. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929.

NOT only is the title of this book very attractive, but it is true to the nature of the study presented. Not only so, but it would be difficult to find a title that would more adequately carry the various movements that are found within the bounds of Hebrew religion. Further, the author has presented the theme in a very alluring fashion. His chapter titles assure us of this. Heroes of Legend, the Birth of a Nation, Interpreters of Destiny, Songs in the Night are but suggestive glimpses of the general treatment.

When we learn from the title-page that the author is special lecturer in English literature in the University of Minnesota, we expect the not too common gift, the use of good English. We are not disappointed. The English is easy, vivid, and often arresting. A few illustrations from the field of literature and an occasional comparison with modern religious

struggles prevent us from feeling that he is interpreting experiences of a people who lived and suffered two thousand years ago.

On the whole it is a worthy attempt to present the old message to the modern reader. That he has done so in 150 pages indicates that only the great crises and the great leaders are featured in this story. To most of the readers this will be most satisfactory. The pathway of progress is well outlined, and the student may fill in the detail at leisure. It is true the author is not an expert in Old Testament studies. Hence there are many inaccuracies throughout the book. Nineveh was destroyed before 606 B. C. Few would think that in the covenant with Abraham there was implicit the idea of universality of Jehovah, or that the Hebrews came out of the Babylonian civilization, or that Solomon's Red Sea fleet brought India a thousand miles nearer, or that Indian products or any other became in the time of Solomon a drug in the Western market. So we might continue, merely suggesting the great difficulty of mastering the wealth of material that is today tributary to Old Testament studies. Nevertheless we object to the old proverb, " A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." A start is necessary, and Mr. Powell has made a good start. He has a good approach. His arrangement of material and perspective are excellent. His religious enthusiasm is always ready to flame out, and the result is a healthy, stimulating introduction to a great theme.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

The Life and the Book. HILARY G. RICHARDSON. The Macmillan Company. 1929.

TWELVE, the number of the chapters, suggests apostolic succession, while the title links this little volume very definitely with modern experiences. It is a human document, almost wholly biographic, hence quite modern; in it there is the experience and the passion of the pioneer, hence Apostolic. The boy who sacrificed a chicken in order that the deity of his universe might answer his prayer for a rifle was a religious idealist; while the boy whose faith in sacrifice collapsed when neither prayer nor sacrifice brought response, was a realist. So the two strains have blended throughout the life of the author. Shocked over and over again by facts in the Book or by experiences in the Christian community, his enthusiasm and religious idealism have never failed.

Incidently his arraignment of the men in the ministry is worth pondering. That he " never came across but one clergyman who made any pretense to a scholarly knowledge of the Bible " draws attention to the seriousness of the actual situation. His conclusion that the study of Hebrew and

Greek should be left to the great universities where they can be faced without theological prejudice and where the real values of the Bible must stand on their own merits is the result of an educational history, of which the reviewer knows very little. No Seminary that is worthy of the name can handle the Biblical languages or even the English Bible in any other way than that in which they are handled in the best graduate schools in the country. If the theories of yesterday, philological or theological, cannot stand all the light of scholarship, then so much the worse for the theories. The truth and frankness in facing truth are essential. The author has told us of his search and some of the results. The book is worth while, and should have a wide circulation.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

The Book of Job. W. G. JORDAN, Professor of Hebrew Literature, Queen's University, Kingston, Ont. The Macmillan Company. 1929.

THIS is an attempt to present the substance and the spirit of the book of Job without going too far into technical questions of translation and exegesis. Within the space of one hundred and ninety pages Doctor Jordan has admirably attained his purpose. Very simply and lucidly, using suggestive illustrations, he shows the serious need of Biblical criticism, both "higher" and "lower." Then he introduces the reader to the problems of Job, showing the differences between the prose and the poetry sections, and between the main body of the poem and the Elihu sections and the speech of the Almighty. He assumes that the reader wishes to know the truth and is ready to follow the evidence. Then comes the interpretation and beauty of the book, followed by a translation and running exposition of the important sections. The closing chapter is on those passages that are regarded an additions. Those who are interested in great poetry, profound philosophy, and a vital religion, will find in this little volume an illuminating introduction to one of the treasures of the ages.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

Taboo in the Hebrew Scriptures. JACOB SINGER. Open Court Publishing Company. 1928.

DOCTOR SINGER has gathered under one cover the most important passages in the Old Testament on taboo. They are well organized under the heads, food, sex, persons, places, and things, and in many cases are paralleled by similar practises among other peoples. The concluding chapter is a very sane interpretation of the development of taboo in the Scriptures, indicating the evident growth in ethical conceptions. A short bibliography is appended for the student who wishes to pursue the topic further. The

book will be found of great value to those who wish ready access to the Old Testament material.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

The Foundation of Jewish Ethics. Being Volume I of The Teachings of Judaism from the Sources. Compiled by DR. SIMON BERNFELD. Authorized translation from the second revised and enlarged German edition by ARMIN HAJMAN KOLLER, Ph. D. The Macmillan Company. 1929.

FOR those who would understand Judaism this is an indispensable volume. Five writers have cooperated in presenting the source material and competent interpretations of it by leaders in Judaism. Necessarily there has been selection of material, and this has been directed by an interest in Judaism. This is as it should be. The best rather than the worst represents the essential spirit of any movement.

The themes, morality as a basic requirement, fundamental views of morality, purity of soul, freedom of the will, reward and punishment, equality of all human beings, the will to live and knowledge and morality, indicate not only the range of interest but also the general attitude found in the book. Such a selection is admirable even though it indicates that there are Jews and Jews.

The book is well documented. Sources are always given and a very inclusive bibliography is appended to each chapter. It is no story-book with which to while away an idle hour, but for the student it is a thesaurus from which may be gathered the gems of religious thought that express the highest religious and moral ideals of a great people.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians (Harvard Theological Studies XIV, issued as an extra number of the *Harvard Theological Review*). JAMES HARDY ROPES. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1929. Pp. 46.

RECENTLY the Judaizers have fallen upon the lean years. Lightfoot might say in his Commentary on Galatians (p. 311) "Henceforth [that is, after the Jerusalem conference described in Acts 15] St. Paul's career was one life-long conflict with Judaizing antagonists," but there has been an increasing tendency to qualification. The Corinthian correspondence, the epistle to the Philippians and the Romans have been interpreted in a manner that denies specifically opposition to a group of Jewish Christians. Jews, yes; Jewish Christians, no. So Professor Ropes could write a few months ago in a stimulating essay, "*The Epistle to the Romans and Jewish Christianity*":[1]

[1] *Studies in Early Christianity* edited by Shirley Jackson Case, presented to Frank Chamberlin Porter and Benjamin Wisner Bacon (1928), pp. 353-365.

The Judaizing emissaries from Jerusalem, who failed in Galatia, did not in later years venture on another, and less hopeful, experiment further west, at a time when Paul's enhanced prestige would have made him a more dangerous opponent in that particular controversy (p. 365).

And Professor Riddle of the University of Chicago would go even further in laying this erstwhile vigorous specter.[2]

Yet in spite of their expulsion from the West they have remained firmly entrenched in Galatia. We have not been quite certain where Galatia was, but we have had at least the confidence that the Judaizers did not share our perplexity but had hastened thither on purpose-bent from Jerusalem. So after a few perfunctory observations about the perfect lucidity of the nature of the Galatian difficulty the critics hastened to the really important matter of Galatia—south, north, or pan. And now arises a disturber in Israel who suggests that after all our confidence in the nature of the disturbance, wherever it was, is not justified. It has been said of that doughty critic, Wilhelm Wrede, that when one chanced to say in his presence that a matter was sure beyond the peradventure of a doubt he would burn the midnight oil to produce an essay flatly denying the indubitable. But even Wrede overlooked Galatia.

Following the lead of Professor Lütgert, formerly of Halle, now of Berlin, whose challenge[3] was unfortunately largely overlooked in the aftermath of the War, Professor Ropes of Harvard has picked up the torch of Wrede. Actually the situation provoking the Galatian epistle is not as simple as has been assumed. On the contrary, many points in the epistle suffer from the assumption that all of Paul's shafts are leveled at the devoted heads of Judaizers. Actually in Galatia, as in Corinth, there was a group of "perfectionists," pneumatici, radicals, against whom Paul defended himself with customary vigor. They were not the only troublemakers. Judaizers were present, although in the latter pages of his essay Ropes would apparently retract his utterance (quoted above) that they were emissaries from Jerusalem. Instead they were perhaps "gentile Christians [who] had proved susceptible to the efforts of local synagogue Jews, and had tried to persuade the churches as a whole to accept Jewish rites, including circumcision" (p. 45). With this double battle-front, hostile to each other in all save their opposition to him, Paul finds himself opposed.

And it must be confessed that much in the epistle is most satisfactorily explained on the basis of this assumption. No more perplexing verse to the

[2] "The So-called Jewish Christians," *Anglican Theological Review*, July, 1929, pp. 15-33.

[3] *Gesetz und Geist: eine Untersuchung zur Vorgeschichte des Galaterbriefs* (*Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, XXII, 6), Gütersloh, 1919.

interpreter of Paul exists than 5:11, "But I, brethren, if I still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted?" on the assumption that Paul's whole attack is against Judaizers. But if he is defending himself against the charge of being too good a Jew, it is crystal clear. Again, the ethical section is more adequately explained, perhaps, on the assumption that he is opposed to a group whose "spiritual attainments" have freed them from the ordinary amenities of life than as an attempt to forestall the charge of legalists that freedom from the Mosaic law must result in license. Or again in the section 3:1 to 5:10 which even Lütgert and Ropes would admit is directed primarily against Judaizers there is a curious reserve and caution in Paul's argument, a hesitancy perhaps strange if he were concerned alone with Judaizers—although Paul is wont to clutter up his argument with Biblical quotations—but natural if along with an attack on Judaizers there is the necessity of defending the importance of Hebrew tradition for Christians. And finally the spirited defense of himself and of his freedom from entangling alliances with Jerusalem is perhaps more naturally explained on the basis of an anti-Jewish extreme of the type of the later Paulinist Marcion than on that of opposition to a group who could hardly have taken offense at such a relation, even had it existed. Yet it may be suggested in line with this last section that perhaps Professor Ropes has not sufficiently considered the possibility that Paul's denial of contact with Jerusalem was to spike the objection, "You have falsified the gospel you have taught," by the counter-claim, "I never was taught anything by that group. My gospel came from God and from him alone."

It would be beyond the purpose of this review to clash spears with Professor Ropes even if I had the desire; and frankly I have not. It appears to me that the essay, while not perhaps constituting a mathematical proof—and he would be the last to assert that it did—does compel us to reread this most "Pauline of the Paulines" with fresh interest.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

Pagan Regeneration—A Study of Mystery Initiations in the Græco-Roman World. HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY, Associate Professor of New Testament Literature, The University of Chicago. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1929. Pp. xi and 307. Price, $3.00.

THERE are few problems more difficult and at the same time more fascinating for the student of Christian beginnings than that of the relationship of Christianity with the other mystery cults of the Mediterranean world. And here as elsewhere positions diametrically opposed are championed by zealous investigators. Too often we have been led to negative conclusions because of apologetic reasons. The mystery cults were obscene in their nature—do not the Church Fathers so assert?—how then

could Christianity in its early state of pristine purity have been influenced by them? Only when it had lost its soul did it become contaminated.

Professor Willoughby has done a very valuable piece of work in this essay by revealing how rash it is to form conclusions about other religions on the basis of what their enemies have said in attack. As he states in his preface, the book is a prolegomenon to a further study of Christian origins. In this volume he is concerned with the cults themselves, and has wisely refrained from any attempt to compare them with the Christian cult or to discuss the question of dependence. Before that question can be profitably considered it is necessary to know the nature of that which one would compare.

In ten penetrating chapters he has set forth what can be known about the nature, ideals, and purpose of the various cults in the Roman world at the time when the Christian movement came to birth. And he has made perfectly clear that they were decidedly "going-concerns," and not morally bankrupt.

He shows himself as perfectly at home in the field, and the quiet unpretentious way in which he has made the non-Christian writers themselves yield their evidence carries conviction. Instead of discussing the various cults as a whole he has devoted a separate chapter to each. And as one finishes the study of each chapter he has before him the essential characteristics in convenient form.

Not only for the lay reader—its value for him can hardly be exaggerated—but for the teacher who is obliged to introduce his students to these cults with which Christianity found itself in the liveliest competition this book is more than timely. With no intention of being fulsome in its praise it is but fair to say that it would be difficult to see how it could be bettered.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

How to Understand the Gospels. ANTHONY C. DEANE, M. A., Vicar of All Saints, Ennismore Gardens, and Hon. Canon of Worcester Cathedral. New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1929. Pp. 212. Price, $1.50.

A POPULAR and not very penetrating rehearsal of the elementary facts about the four Gospels. It is intended for that modern Theophilus whose certainty concerning the things wherein he has *not* been instructed is the constant endeavor of modern writers. Yet it is to be observed that while many authors today make a great parade of striving to illumine the ignorance of the layman most of them are yet eager to impress the scholars with what they could do if they tried. Mr. Deane has not done this. His enthusiasm for the Gospels is real and at times contagious; he hopes to arouse a similar response in his readers' minds by telling them a few

of the simple facts about the books, and showing them how they should be read.

The tone of the book is extremely—perhaps excessively is not too strong a word—conservative. In the latter chapter the atrocious epithets fundamentalist and modernist unfortunately appear. But it is written in a sweet and good-humored strain. "Theophilus" may learn a good many things which other "Lukes" would have phrased differently, if not oppositely, but if he heeds the instruction of the author to read the Gospels for himself he will not perhaps be seriously injured.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Education and Religion. CHARLES FRANKLIN THWING, D. D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 254. Price, $2.00.

THE publication of eighteen college commencement and convocation addresses, including the four Bedell Lectures for 1926-27, delivered in the course of years by Doctor Thwing, president emeritus of Western Reserve University and Adelbert College and a graduate of Harvard, Class 1876. They are of purely inspirational value.

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

Pass On the Torch. ALLEN EASTMAN CROSS. Foreword by GEORGE A. GORDON. Boston and Chicago: The Pilgrim Press.

A BOOK of beautiful hymns and free verse. The hymns are offered to any who wish to use them, publishers or others. Dr. George A. Gordon calls the author "the best writer of hymns of his generation." The Editor has had pleasure and profit in reading them. He notes that "the stars" have a way of getting into a large number of the verses in an intriguing way.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

"Edgar Young Mullins." ISLA MAY MULLINS. Nashville, Tenn.: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.

AN intimate biography of the late president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, written by his wife. The book will be welcomed by all the students of that seminary in particular, and by the denomination in general as a faithful record of an outstanding religious leader and his wife in their intimate experiences in the life of the Baptists.

SPENSER B. MEESER.